



तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN  
VISWABHARATI  
LIBRARY

१०५

J. G. I. S.

(1938) Vol. 5





THE  
JOURNAL  
OF THE  
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

EDITED BY  
U. N. GHOSHAL

**VOL. V, 1938**

*Published by the Greater India Society*

CALCUTTA  
1938.





**THE  
JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY  
Vol. V (1938)**

**CONTENTS**

<b>Articles:</b>	<b>Page</b>
Contributions from the <i>Mahāvamśa</i> to our knowledge of the mediaeval culture of Ceylon (Dr. Wilhelm Geiger) ... ..	1, 93
Copper-plates of Kembang Arum, 824 Śaka (Mr. H. B. Sarkar) ... ..	31
Epigraphic notes (Dr. D. C. Sircar) ... ..	154
Indo-Japanese images in Berlin, Amsterdam, and London Museums (Dr. F. M. Schnitger) ... ..	22
Kaṭāha (Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri) ... ..	128
Kaṭāhanagara in the <i>Kaumudimahotsava</i> (Dr. D. C. Sircar) ... ..	59
New drama of Aśvaghoṣa (Prof. Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya) ... ..	51
Note on Indian proto-types of the Papar relief (Mr. J. N. Banerjea) ... ..	54
Note on a type of Lokeśvara in Cambodge (Dr. U. N. Ghoshal) ... ..	56
Rāṣṭrapālanāṭaka of Aśvaghoṣa (Dr. E. H. Johnston)	151
Some notes on the kingdom of Dvāravati (Dr. H. G. Quaritch Wales) ... ..	24
Some Indian parallels of Lokeśvara types in Indo- China (Dr. U. N. Ghoshal) ... ..	147
<b>Notices of Books</b> ... ..	61, 159
<b>Editorial Notes</b> ... ..	169
<b>Obituary</b> (Mr. N. G. Majumdar) ... ..	157

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

	Page
Banerjea, Mr. Jitendra Nath, <i>A note on the Indian prototypes of the Papar relief</i> ...	54
Bhattacharya, Prof. Vidhushekhara, <i>A new drama of Aśvaghoṣa</i> ... ..	51
Ghoshal, Dr. U. N., <i>Note on a type of Lokeśvara in Cambodge</i> ... ..	56
<i>Some Indian parallels of Lokeśvara types in Indo-China</i> ... ..	147
Geiger, Dr. Wilhelm, <i>Contributions from the Māhavaṃsa to our knowledge of the mediaeval culture of Ceylon</i> ... ..	1, 93
Johnston, Dr. E. H., <i>Rāṣṭrapālanāṭaka of Aśvaghoṣa</i> ... ..	151
Sarkar, Mr. Himansu Bhusan, <i>Copper plates of Kembang Arum</i> ... ..	31
Sastri, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta, <i>Kaṭāha</i> ... ..	128
Schnitger, Dr. F. M., <i>Indo-Javanese images in Berlin, Amsterdam and London Museums</i> ... •	22
Sircar, Dr. D. C., <i>Kaṭāhanagara in the Kaumudī-mahotsava</i> ... ..	59
<i>Epigraphic Notes</i> ... ..	154
Wales, Dr. H. G. Quaritch, <i>Some notes on the kingdom of Dvāravati</i> ... ..	24

# THE JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

---

**VOL. V**

**JANUARY, 1938**

**No. 1**

---

## **Contributions from the Mahāvamsa to our knowledge of the Mediaeval culture of Ceylon**

*By* DR. WILHELM GEIGER

*(Continued from JGIS., Vol. IV, No. 2)*

### IV

#### *7. System of Administration and its development*

• 44. As to the administration of the Sinhalese kingdom during the mediæval times we do not learn much from the *Mahāvamsa*. The priestly compilers of the chronicle, Dhammakitti and his unknown successor, had no particular interest in the matter in as much as the royal orders did not concern the Buddhist community. Moreover we must bear in mind that the two chroniclers were living, the first at the end of the 12th, the second near the middle of the 14th century. They may often have seen the past in the light of their own times. The eventuality of an anachronism must therefore sometimes be taken into consideration.

The points that we can glean from the *Mahāvamsa* are confined to single casual notices. We are also able to draw inferences from the titles of the numerous officers and officials mentioned in the chronicle. But it would, for instance, be beyond my scope, if I should try to explain the

technical terms in the inscriptions concerning the system of land-tenure prevalent during the mediæval period with the help of analogies from South India, or to enter into similar intricate problems. For such subjects I must refer to works like that of H. W. Codrington, *A Short History of Ceylon*<sup>1</sup> or of G. C. Mendis, *Early History of Ceylon*.<sup>2</sup> I can only consider it as my task to supplement and enlarge, and sometimes also to confirm, what those works contain, by means of details taken from the Pāli chronicle.

Two facts must be pointed out in advance. There can be no doubt that custom and tradition were all-powerful in Ceylon, and that the village communities which represent the lowest administrative units enjoyed much independence of the central governments. The kings rarely interfered with them, except perhaps when the royal officials visited them annually to administer justice and to collect taxes due to the king.<sup>3</sup> The Sinhalese were mostly agriculturists and closely attached to their home and their soil. Their whole life was regulated and determined by the field-work, and what they wanted was above all peace and order. They were conservative, and old institutions could endure unaltered through many centuries, even up to modern times. Under such circumstances, administration in mediæval Ceylon was more extensive than intensive, concerning the totality of the people, but not penetrating too deeply into the daily life of the individuals.

45. The Village-Community, as we said, was the smallest unit in the administration of the Sinhalese kingdom. The idea and the institution were brought to Ceylon by the first Aryan immigrants from their home in North-Western India. Tradition ascribes the establishment of the village boundaries to Paṇḍukābhaya, the fourth king

1 P. 42 sq., 67 sq.

2 P. 55 sq., 82 sq., 99 sq.

3 G. C. Mendis, loc. cit., p. 56.

of the Island, i.e., to half-mythical or legendary times (*Mhvs.*, 10.103).

The affairs of the village-community were looked after by the village-headman (*gāmanāyaka*, 68.53). We are not informed by the chronicle whether he obtained his position by inheritance, or was appointed by the ruler. The soil was considered to be the king's property and the farmers were, therefore, tenants who had to pay a tax (*bali*, *ḥara*) in return for the protection they received from the king. In the ancient *Mahāvamsa* a 'labour-village' (*ḥammantagāmā*, 23.4) is mentioned. We may suppose that the tenants of such a village were liable to supply, besides the regular tax, unpaid labour to the lord.

Frequently the revenue of a village was granted by the king to a monastery or a temple. The large extent of temple property was a feature of the mediæval times in Ceylon.<sup>4</sup> Parakkamabāhu I is said to have granted numerous villages to priests living in a fraternity (*gaṇa-vāsinam*, 74.48). In 84.3 villages are mentioned which belonged to the Buddha and the Doctrine (*buddha-dhammāyattagāmā*), requisite-villages (*paccayaggāmā*) which had to provide a certain monastery with the four necessities (seats, garments, food and medicines), villages belonging to a priestly fraternity (*gaṇa-santaka-gāmākā*), and villages belonging to a *pariveṇa*, i.e., to a college where scientific studies were cultivated (*pāriveṇaka-gāmā*).

But villages were also granted to single individuals (*puggalikagāmā*, 84.4), to a priest as well as to a layman. The villages of the eight sanctuaries (*aṭṭhāyatana-gāmākā*) seem to have been given by the king to the eight grand *theras* who were living in those sanctuaries (84.18). Often services rendered to the king by an officer were rewarded by the donation of a village. No doubt the revenues of one or more villages were the salary of the officials. Such a

<sup>4</sup> Codrington, l. c., p. 43.

grant could be for life or also hereditary. In the latter case the villages are called *paveṇigāmā*, the word *paveṇi* meaning in this connection lineage, succession, and I think that *ḷula-santaḷa-gāma* 'village possessed by a family' has the same meaning. In 84.1 we meet with the expression *ḷula-ppaveṇikāyatta-gāma*. King Vijayabāhu I (1059-1114) gave to many authors of poems befitting gifts of money together with hereditary villages, and King Parakkamabāhu II rewarded the services of his minister Devapaṭirāja by granting him villages which he had founded as family property (*ḷula-santaḷa*, 86.54). When in the 11th century Kittī and Buddha, two generals of prince Kassapa, the former dwelling in the village Makkhakudrūsa, the latter a native of Māragalla, had expelled the Coḷas from Rohaṇa, the prince allowed them to utter a wish. We must suppose, I believe, that from the two villages, as they are explicitly mentioned in the chronicle, they took the revenues as their regular salary, and we will understand that Buddha chose as his wish a *paveṇi-gāma* so that his privilege became hereditary in his family. Kittī wished that his village should be exempted from the duty it was liable to pay to the community so that in future the revenues would accrue to him without diminution (55.26 sq.).

46. The taxes were collected by officials who visited the single villages (Mhvs., 87.50), probably on annual circuits. But the chronicle does not tell us the percentage of the lord's share of the crop. It was perhaps not always the same, but varying at different times. Grants were also often resumed and transferred to another individual or group of individuals if that was in the king's interest. King Vikkamabāhu, 12th century, took the maintenance villages which belonged to the community and gave them to his attendants (61.54) in order to secure their attachment to the crown. Oppression of the rustic people occurred no doubt frequently. The *gāmaḷabhojaka*, the 'usagers of the village revenues' were the picture of greediness (61.73). At the beginning of the twelfth century,

when Ceylon was divided into kingdoms, the rulers squeezed out the whole people in their insatiable greed as sugarcane in a sugar mill by levying excessive taxes (61.53). The people dwelling in places difficult of access even refused to pay the dues formerly levied on them and dwelt independently, each in his own district (61.70-71). This was the beginning of the kingdom's dissolution owing to extortionate taxation.

Sometimes the kings themselves relieved the distress of their subjects by remitting the dues (36.26). In the so-called Galpota inscription at Polonnaruwa King Nissanka Malla boasts of having remitted taxes for five years. They also enacted a law that in collecting revenue from lands and fields the taxes should not exceed a certain amount fixed by the law (*Epigraphia Zeylanica* II, p. 116). Vijayabāhu, afterwards Vijayabāhu IV, as Mahādipāda is said to have paid the taxes for villages which were in distress from his own purse (87.50).

In improving the cultivation of the country the rulers never neglected their own interest, the increase of the revenue. Parakkamabāhu displayed an admirable activity in constructing tanks and other works of similar kinds in order to extend the cultivated area of his province Dakkhinadesa (68.8 sq.). Thereby the new fields were made to yield a tax which was greater than the old taxes produced in the kingdom. At the same time he brought it to pass that the inhabitants of the country never more knew fear of famine (68.54-55). He understood that the welfare of the people and that of the crown went hand in hand. But his chief aim was the improvement of his finances so that he might be able to establish by war a universal dominion over Laṅkā. He desired, however, that this should be obtained without oppressing the people.

47. It seems that the final form of administration was at least in part the work of Parakkamabāhu. He carried it through in Dakkhinadesa and transferred it to other provinces after having obtained the supremacy over the whole island.



There is an interesting passage in the Mahāvamsa where his reforms in Dakkhinadesa are described (69.27 sq.). Having examined the financial situation as it had been under his predecessor, and having seen that the public revenue was insufficient for realising his plans, he separated the finance (*attha*) and the army (*bala*) administration from each other and made them over to two officials who occupied the highest rank. He created in this way two chief Ministries, a Ministry of War, and a Ministry for financial administration.

It is noticeable that this arrangement exactly corresponds to the differentiation in the Kauṭaliya Arthaśāstra of *daṇḍa* 'army' and *kośa* 'treasury' (B. Breloer, *Staatsverwaltung im alten Indien* I, p. 407). 'It is by means of the treasury and the army that the king can hold under his control both his and his enemy's party' (*Kauṭ.* I. 4. 1. tr. Shamasastri, p. 9). We can take it for granted and it is confirmed also by other observations that the Kauṭaliya was known in Ceylon in the twelfth century and even earlier, and had some influence upon its political development. We have seen (para. 11 above) that the study of this work was a part of princely education.

In order to facilitate the work of the Home department Parakkamabāhu divided the province into two halves. Whilst the two chief ministers seem to have been appointed personally by the ruler, the superintendents of the two halves came to their position in regular advancement (*kaṃāgatā*). They must have the necessary expert knowledge and therefore work their way up through the various grades of service.

Finally the ruler created what we may call royal domains. He separated from the districts all land of extraordinary value where pearls or precious stones were found and appointed a special official who was entrusted with its administration. This official had apparently the same position as the *ākaraḍhyakṣa* of the Kauṭaliya (II.11.30); his department was named *antaraṅga-dhura*,

because he had to deal with the subterranean (or submarine) elements or treasures. There can be no doubt that the whole produce of the mines was royal revenue ; the work in the mines was probably done by slaves. Such valuable land (*sāratṭhāna*) existed, as the chronicle tells us, in the pearl districts on the sea coast, in the district Ratnākara which corresponds to the modern Ratnapura, 'city of jewels', and in the mountainous province Malaya.

### 8. *The State-officials*

48. The number of state-officials who are mentioned in the *Mahāvamsa* is really bewildering, and it is often difficult to say whether such a term must be understood as a mere rank or title, or should be associated with a public function and strictly defined sphere of action. Even honorary titles of this kind, which are spoken of above in para. 27, were frequently conferred on officers in the army, as that of a *kesadhātunāyaka* on the generals Kitti and Rakkha, and that of a *nagaragalla* on Saṅkhadhātu (70.279-280). Gokaṇṇa, an officer of king Gajabāhu, and one of Parakkamabāhu named Kitti, had both the title *nagaragiri*; the title *laṅkāpura* is given to other generals (66. 35 ; 76. 60 ; 70. 143 ; 72.39 sq. ; 75. 181). In 76. 82 sq., 77. 3 sq. *Laṅkāpura* is used as personal noun of an officer in Parakkamabāhu's army.

Above all the two words *saciva* and *amacca* require some remarks. The term *saciva*, to begin with, can hardly be explained in a satisfactory way. It means nearly the same as *amacca*, if we are told in some passages that the King took counsel with his *saciva* (52. 71 ; 54. 67) and with his *amacca* in others (70.77,80). Both words denote the King's councillors, and a similar general meaning must be assumed when the chronicler says that the king employed in the administration *sacivā* who were loyally devoted to him (*dalhabhattino*, 67. 90), or that he ordered the *sacivā* to perform such and such a work (68. 7,18). But in other passages the term must be understood in a more restricted sense. The denomination of Gajabāhu's general mentioned

above *Gokaṇṇa-saciva* seems to have been his regular title (63.34; 70.71,83). Of the two officers who expelled the Coḷas from Rohaṇa (cf. 48) to one, Kittī, the title *saciva* is given, to the other, Buddha, the title *amacca* (55.26). Afterwards (55.30), however, both are called *sacivā*. It will be advisable, for the present, to take the term as a synonym of *amacca* and to ascribe to it a general meaning such as 'dignitary'.

As to *amacca* so much seems to be certain that it denotes a *rank*, the supreme rank within the body of state-officials. Generally the term is rendered by 'minister' but this translation does by no means fit in with all or most passages where the word occurs in the chronicle. There were, of course, 'ministers' in the Sinhalese kingdom, the chiefs of a determined department, as we shall see below in 53. But officers of the army are also styled *amaccā*, no doubt, the highest among them, the commanders of a larger body of troops. Gajabāhu himself ranks the General Gokaṇṇa among his *amaccā* (70.79), fortified places are put under the command of *amaccā* (70.135), and the whole body of generals in Parakkamabāhu's army are comprehended in the words *mahāamaccā* (72.96, 129) or *mahāmattā* (72.70, 182). The commander-in-chief, General Mañju, is stated to have taken counsel in the field with his staff, and we meet here with an interesting distinction of rank. The staff consisted of *amaccā* and *padhānā*, that is, of the commanders and higher officers or staff-officers (74.169, 176, 179), and I should propose to translate both terms in this way if stress is laid upon their military character. Otherwise, if it does not denote a minister, *amacca* may be rendered as 'dignitary'.

49. I begin with the *court-officials*, and first with the *Sword-bearer* (*asiggāhaḥa* or *khaggagāhaḥa*) and the *Umbrella-bearer* (*Chattaggāhaḥa*). They were of the highest rank and often closely related to the king. King Moggallāna I, 496-513, appointed Śīlākāla sword-bearer and gave him his sister to wife (*Mhvs.*, 39.54); Aggabodhi II's, 601-611, sword-bearer was a kinsman of the Queen (42.42).

Soththisena's (5th cent.) umbrella-bearer was his son-in-law, the husband of his daughter Saṃghā (38.1). By Moggallāna III, 611-17, the son of his Senāpati was entrusted with the office of the sword-bearer (44.43). Prince Parakkamabāhu's sword-bearer and umbrella-bearer are mentioned together in 66.29. We also meet with the titles *chattagāhakaṇātha* (59.16) and *chattagāhakaṇāyaka* (72.68). But I believe that these forms are merely periphrastic 'the official who is the umbrella-bearer' and ought not to be translated with 'head of the umbrella-bearers', for it seems that there was always only one sword-bearer as well as one umbrella-bearer at court.

Another court-office is that of the *Treasurer* (*bhaṇḍāgārādhiḱārī*). There was more than one treasurer in the royal service. When Parakkamabāhu ascended the throne, he with the help of the treasurers of his predecessor examined the state of the finances (69.27). The scribes (*lekḥakā*) were subordinate officials in the treasury department. By ordering his scribes to insinuate themselves with the various groups of the king's scribes Prince Parakkamabāhu could spy out in Pulatthinagara Gaḍabāhu's financial situation (66.154-55). The *koṣṭhāgārādhyakṣaḥ* in the Kauṭaliya and as subordinate officials the *lekḥakāḥ* correspond to the Sinhalese officials mentioned above (Kauṭ. 2.15.1, 2.9.16; Shamasastri's tr., pp. 112, 79). The *mahālekḥa* 'grand scribe' (52.33; 72.1, 161 etc.) was either the chief of the scribes, or perhaps had to elaborate the royal edicts and letters. We see from the Kauṭaliya (2.10, Shamasastri's tr., p. 80 sq.) that this function was considered to be of the greatest importance. Several titles end in *poththakī*. Since this word is obviously connected with *poththaka*, *Sk. pustaka*, 'book', we may suppose that they denote members of the account-office who had to book the king's receipts and expenses. Such officials were the *bhaṇḍārapoththakī* (72.169) whose function must have been associated with that of the *bhaṇḍāgārādhiḱārī*, the *ādipoththakī* (72.27, 160, 182, 207) or *mūlapoththakī* (75.139-40), and the *jīvita-*

*potthakīn* (70.174, 318; 72.161). We are however unable to define the peculiar sphere of action for each of these different *potthakīns*. The *saṅkhanāyaka* seems also to have been an accountant, approximately corresponding to the *saṅkhyāyaka* of the Kauṭaliya (2.1 etc.). Strangely enough, where all these titles occur in the chronicle, their bearers are engaged in military operations.

There was a host of *chamberlains* (*kañcuḍīn*) at court with a chief-chamberlain (*kañcuḍīnāyaka*, 72.58) at the head. The chamberlains are officials of lower rank standing on the same level with barbers and cooks (63.53; 69.26; 70.44). By Parakkamabāhu's generals the chamberlains were appointed for guarding Queen Sugala's treasures seized by them in their victorious campaigns in Rohaṇa (75.176). The 'Door-keeper' (*dovāriḍa*, 35.51) must also be reckoned among the chamberlains.

50. Among the *military officials* the *Senāpati* holds the foremost rank. Synonyms are *camūpati*, *dhajinīpati*, *seninda*, *senānātha*. The *senāpacca* (office of the *senāpati*) was the most prominent office in the mediæval Sinhalese kingdom. The position of the *Senāpati* in Ceylon exactly corresponds to that of the *Senāpati* in India according to the Kauṭaliya (2.33; p. 140<sup>8</sup>). There he is the highest commander of the whole army and ranks with the heir-apparent and the *purohita* (5.3, p. 245<sup>5</sup>, Shamasastri's tr., p. 307; O. Stein, *Megasthenes und Kauṭilya*, p. 158 sq.).

In the ancient time Ariṭṭha was the sister's son (*bhāgineyya*) and the *Senāpati* of King Devānampiyatissa (11.25); so also was Vasabha of King Yasalālakatissa (35.59). In the 5th century King Dhātusena also appointed his sister's son *Senāpati* (38.81). 'I do not however think that the conclusion is warranted that this position was reserved for the *bhāgineyya*. He could indeed become *Senāpati* if he had the necessary qualifications and if he possessed the confidence of the monarch, but the king was not bound in his choice by conditions of relationship' (Cūlavamsa, tr. I, p. xxvii). Of course, the king will have first sought for the right man

within the royal family. King Mahinda II, 772-92, entrusted his own brave son Mahinda with the dignity of a *Senāpati*, he himself having been the *Senāpati* of his father Aggābodhi VI (48.78). Sena Ilaṅga, the *Senāpati* of King Kassapa IV, 896-913, is also said to have been of royal lineage (*rājavamśaja*, 52.16). But our chronicle mentions a whole series of *Senāpatīs* by name without saying whether and how they were related to the king. Migāra was the *Senāpati* of Kassapa I (39.6), Uttara, that of Moggallāna I (39.58), Vajira of Dappula II (49.80), Bhadda of Sena I (50.82), Kutṭhaka of Sena II (51.88), Rakkhaka Ilaṅga of Dappula II (53. 11), Sena of Mahinda IV and Sena V (54.13,58). Udaya, the later *Senāpati* of Sena V was *amacca* (54.60) and Viduragga, the *Senapati* of Udaya IV, 10th century, was a *nāyaka* (53.46), ere the dignity of *Senāpati* was conferred upon them. They came therefore both from the body of officers. The *Senāpati* of Kittisirimegha was Saṅkha (64.22) who had to prepare the *Upa-nayana* ceremony for young Parakkamabāhu, but he was afterwards killed by the prince (65.13 sq.). A great tumult arose at this deed. Saṅkha's successor in the dignity was Deva (63.82). The same name is that of Parakkamabāhu's *Senāpati*; he was perhaps also the same person. Deva plays an important part in Parakkamabāhu's wars with Gajabāhu and the minor Mānābharaṇa, but he appears to have come to a luckless end (72.138 sq.).

No *Senāpati* is mentioned during the interval from the death of Parakkamabāhu I in the year 1186 to the reign of Vijayabāhu IV, 1271-73. Even Virabāhu, the sister's son of Parakkamabāhu II is not called *Senāpati*, though he was the chief leader of the Sinhalese army in the war with the Jāvakas (83.41). Vijayabāhu IV's *Senāpati* was Mitta (90.219), who himself usurped the crown after the death of his lord. But he was killed by Ṭhakuraka, the chief of Rājput mercenaries, and the heir-apparent ascended the throne as Bhuvanekabāhu I in the year 1273.

The two titles *Sakṣasenāpati* (or *Sakṣasenānī*) and

*Andhasenāpati* are difficult to explain. In the former, the first part of the compound *Sakka*, seems to be the name *Sakra*, commonly used in the Pali literature for the god Indra. The post of *Sakhasenāpati* was granted by king Kassapa V, 10th century, to his own son (52. 52 sq.), who afterwards died during a campaign in South India. The dignity was then conferred upon the son of the deceased *Sakhasenāpati* (52. 79). Both, son and grandson of king Kassapa, are mentioned in Sinhalese inscriptions with the title *Sak-maha-āmati* = Pali *Sakḥamahāmacca* (Wickremasinghe, *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, I, pp. 183, 190 n. 7); the former is also called *Sak-senevi* in another lithic record (II. II, p. 41 sq.). Here *senevi* clearly points to the office, and *maha-āmati* (Pali *mahāmacca*) the rank.

As to *Andhasenāpati* Buddhadatta Thera refers me to the fact that Andhra is the name of a tribe in Southern India. He thinks that the *Andhasenāpati* was a commander of Andhra mercenaries, but I believe that the expression *senāpati* is not suited for such an officer; he would rather have been called *nāyaka*. The title occurs only once in the *Mahāvamsa* (41. 87). King Kittisirimegha, 6th century, gave the rank of an *Andhasenāpati* (*andhasenā-pativhayam thānantaram*) to Mahānāga who afterwards became his successor.

51. Titles of officers in the army are not numerous in the chapters describing the Sinhalese history before the twelfth century. The *Senāpati*, of course, is often mentioned, and some general expressions denoting a commander of troops are met with, as *balanāyaka* or *senādhi-nāyaka*. But a bewildering mass of such titles occurs in the era of Parakkamabāhu I, and it is difficult and sometimes impossible to determine them in an accurate manner.

I begin with the two titles *adhiḥārin* and *adhinātha* (or *adhināyaka*). Here we are able to state that the rank of the former was higher than that of the latter. It is told in 70. 278 that Parakkamabāhu after the subjection of Gajabāhu bestowed various distinctions upon his officers.

To the Adhinātha Māyāgeha he gave the rank of an *adhikārin* (*adhikāripadaṃ*). That was no doubt an advancement and *adhikārin* denoted apparently the highest military post. We can safely translate it with 'general' and *adhinātha* perhaps with 'commander'. The title *damīlādhiḱārin* must therefore be understood as 'general of the Damiḷa mercenaries' (75. 20 sq. ; 76. 39 sq.) It seems, however, that both titles were abbreviations of the longer titles *laṅkādhikārin* and *laṅkādhinātha* 'General (Commander) of Laṅkā', which remind us of the French military title *Maréchal de France*.

We may add to what is stated above in 70. 278 that another officer of Parakkamabāhu, Rakkha by name, was also distinguished by the general's title at the same time, for in chapter 70. 24, 98, 105, etc. up to 174 he is called *laṅkādhinātha*, *laṅkādhināyaka*, *laṅkānātha*, but from 70. 283 up to 72. 85-86 (where his death is narrated) *laṅkādhikārin* or in short *adhikārin*.

Kitti, the *saṅkhakanāyaka*, was also made *laṅkādhikārin* according to 70. 278. Before that time he was *laṅkādhinātha* (70. 205-20), but after it he is always denoted with his new title (70. 316) or simply called general (70. 300 ; 72. 21, 122 sq. ; 74. 90-144).

We cannot say whether in the title *camūnātha*, literally 'army-commander', a peculiar rank is implied. It is given to an officer named Rakkha, who must be distinguished from the other Rakkha mentioned above. Perhaps the chronicler himself wished to make this distinction by the particular denomination. Rakkha is called *camūnātha* in chapter 74. 41, 46, 55, 66 and *camūpati* in 74.143 where his death is reported. The title alternates with the synonyms *dhajinīnātha* (74. 145) and *senānātha* (74. 153), but the same Rakkha is also called *senādhināyaka* (74. 42) and even *camūnāthādhiḱārin*, probably because he was the highest commander at that time and in that part of Rohaṇa which was the seat of war for his army.

What I said concerning *camūnātha* may also be applied to the titles *daṇḍanāyaka*, *daṇḍādhināyaka*, *daṇḍanātha*,



*daṇḍādhinātha*. They are given to a third Rakkha (70. 5, 15, 19) in order to distinguish him from other officers bearing the same name. The two brothers Kittī and Saṅkhaḍhātu are commonly called *daṇḍanāyaka-bhātaro* (70. 279 sq.; 72. 36, 162, etc.). We are inclined to assume that *daṇḍādhinātha* (°*ādhināyaka*) implies a higher rank than *daṇḍanātha* (°*nāyaka*) and that both are of lower rank than the *adhikārin*. But frequently those titles are used to denote officers in the army. Thus, for instance, all the commanders in both armies, that of Parakkamabāhu and of his enemies are comprehended by them in 70. 55, 64, 68, etc. The word *sāmanta*, which will be discussed later on, has also frequently that general meaning (61. 63; 70. 67; 74. 127 sq.). I quote the verse 74. 136:

*tadā Rakṣhacamūnātho Kittināmādhikāri ca //*

*tato Bhūtādhikāri sāmanta cāpare pi ca //*

.....and all the other officers.

I have noticed above that all the Potthakins mentioned in the chronicle were officers in the field. Moreover the umbrella-bearer (*chattagāhakanāyaka*) Komba of king Gajabāhu was entrusted in war with the defence of the western-most province of Rājaraṭṭha (70. 60). The chief of the chamberlains (*kañcukināyaka*) Rakkha commanded an army in the Rohaṇa campaign (75. 20). The Grand Scribe (*mahālekha*) Mahinda (72. 1) was one of Parakkamabāhu's generals. We may infer, therefore, that in times of war the command of troops was sometimes also committed to court-officials or to officials of the civil service, provided they possessed the necessary qualification.

52. As in the civil service the *gāmanāyaka* was in charge of the village community, thus the *raṭṭhiya* was the Headman of a district (*raṭṭha*), and the *maṇḍalika* (or *maṇḍalanāyaka*) the Chief of a canton (*maṇḍala*). Frequently the two are mentioned together. After the death of king Aggabodhi VII, 8th century, the chiefs of the cantons with the headmen of the districts (*maṇḍalikā saraṭṭhiyā*) in the North Province refused to pay tribute to

the king (Mhvs., 48. 83). When prince Mahinda, who was sent by king Udaya II, 885-896, with an army against the rebels in Rohaṇa, arrived at Guttasālā, all the rustic people, the chiefs of the cantons and the headmen of the districts (*jānapadā sabbe maṇḍalikā ca raṭṭhiyā*) came to meet him and paid him homage (51. 109). The term *raṭṭhiya* corresponds to Sanskrit *rāṣṭriya* which is used from very ancient times in India for chiefs who were in charge of provinces (H. Ch. Ray, *Dynastic History of Northern India* I, p. 550). Later on, however, in the chronicle the word *raṭṭhiya* is supplanted by *sāmantā*. The *sāmantā* are mentioned side by side with the *maṇḍalikā* (70. 242, 246), as formerly the *raṭṭhiyā*. *Sāmantā* has the general meaning 'officer in the army' and it seems indeed that in Parakkamabāhu's era the chief duty of the *sāmantā* was a military one, that is the organisation of the district militia.

The particular functions of the *kaṃmanātha* or *kaṃmanāyaḥa* are not quite clear. Buddhadatta Thera has suggested that he was a superintendent of public works. The *Kammanātha* Ārakkha (72. 58) and the *Kammanāyaḥa* Añjana (72. 206) were officers in Parakkamabāhu's army, and the latter was entrusted with the care of the two relics of the Tooth and the Bowl after they had been carried away from the Rohaṇa rebels (74. 168).

As the last but not the least among the civil officials, the *Headman of the Merchant's guild* (*seṭṭhinātha* 59. 16) must be mentioned, no doubt a rich man who had great influence in financial affairs. The conformity of his position with that of the *śreṣṭhin* in India is obvious.

53. The highest state-officials were the *ministers*, the *amaccā* in the narrower sense of the word (*cf.* 48). Such ministers were the two officials created by Parakkamabāhu in connection with his reform work (*cf.* 47), the Minister of finances and the Minister of war. They are explicitly called *amaccā*, nay even *mūlāmacca*, 'ministers of the highest rank' (Mhvs., 69. 29, 34). But it is yet doubtful whether the designation 'minister' is justified for the two

*gaṇaḥāmaccā*, also appointed by Parakkamabāhu, who were entrusted with the administration of the two halves of Dakkhinadesa and for the administration of the royal domains (69. 30, 35) though they were dignitaries of high rank. The *Senāpati* must certainly be ranked among the ministers, and I do not believe that his activity was encroached upon in any way by that of the Minister of war just mentioned. The former's task was the strategy and the command in the field of the whole army or at least of its most important part, the latter had to look after the financial preparations of war and the recruiting, equipment and pay of the soldiers.

54. A *State-Council* was the supreme political corporation. We are not informed by the chronicler about the details of this institution, but we are frequently told that the kings before they entered upon an important enterprise used to take counsel (v. *mantay*) with the dignitaries, the *amaccā* (or *sacivū*). King Gajabāhu, for instance, did so when he heard of the first defeats sustained by his generals, and saw that a dangerous war was impending (Mhvs., 70. 77, 80). Parakkamabāhu did the same ere he undertook the campaign against Rāmañña (76. 38). In such cases, I think, we are justified in speaking of a State-council summoned by the ruler. The members of such a meeting were the king's counsellors (*mantino*, Sk. *mantrin*, 66. 113; 89. 27). We do not know the dignitaries who were regularly present at the State-council. It is even doubtful whether their number was limited at all, so that the meeting could be compared with what we now call a cabinet. Probably the 'ministers' were always present, and besides them the king used to summon in each case those dignitaries who had to deal with the actual affair and possessed his confidence. If war or peace were in question, the votes of the *Senāpati* and the Minister of war were no doubt decisive. \*

The resolutions taken by the king in the meetings with his councillors were, if it seemed necessary or advisable, publicly made known to the representatives of the people,

and in this way to the whole kingdom, in a solemn act. To this purpose served a building which was erected in Pulatthinagara by Nissanka Malla, end of the 12th century. Its ruins are at present known under the name, 'Council Chamber.' I would prefer a denomination like Assembly-Hall. On the pillars of the building the places of the delegates are indicated by inscriptions (H. C. P. Bell, *Arch. Survey of Ceylon*, 1904, pp. 8-9; H. W. Codrington, *The Council Chamber Inscriptions*, *Journ. R. As. Soc., Ceylon Br. No. 77*, 1924, p. 304). The king's throne occupied the centre of the southern side of the hall, facing north. On his right side was the seat of the Heir-Apparent (*yuvarāja*) who alone was sitting in the assembly. Next came the Royal Princes (*Ādipādā*), then the *Senāpati* and finally superior officers (*padhānā*) as representatives of the military profession. On the king's left side first stood the Chiefs of the cantons (*Maṇḍalikā*) and then came a group who were, according to Codrington, what we call the Headmen of the districts or their delegates, and on the lowest place the representatives of the merchants and working classes of the people, probably with the *Seṭṭhinātha* at their head.

Near to the Council Chamber there are the ruins of a similar building, the so-called Audience-Hall. Here the stone figure of a lion has been found on which the king's seat was erected (*Cf.* 23 a). In an inscription on this figure the same groups of officials are enumerated as on the pillars of the Council Chamber (E. Miller, *Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon*, no. 146, pp. 65, 93, 127).

No place is reserved in the Council Hall for the councillors (*amaccā*) of the king. Apparently they stood gathered round the throne. This is the reason why I should avoid the name given to the building. No counsel, I think, was taken in the hall, but, when important affairs concerning the whole people were in question, the representatives were summoned to hear an address of the king or the report of one of the ministers.

9. *Administration of Justice.*

55. The information we can gather from the Mahāvamsa concerning the administration of justice is not very copious. The reason may be that for a good deal of jurisdiction the village community and its headman were competent, so that the general public was not much affected by many legal affairs. Criminals who had taken sanctuary in a village could not forcibly be removed by royal officers. In temple-villages the headmen, not the officers of the king, were bound in the case of murder to enquire, record evidence and have the murderer killed; in a case of house-breaking they had to restore the stolen goods to the owner and have the thief hanged. If the criminals were not detected, the village community had to pay a considerable sum as a fine (H. W. Codrington, *Short Hist. of Ceylon*, pp. 43, 44).

In the chronicle we hear very little about judges or courts of justice or about the law-proceedings. The title *dhammagehanāyaka* which occurs in Mhvs., 59. 16 side by side with *chattagāhakanātha* and *setthinātha* perhaps denotes the Chief Justice. I tentatively translated it as 'President of the Court of Justice' (*Cūlavamsa* tr., 1.).

The jurisdiction was to a large extent based on customary law. There is in the chronicle (49. 20) the interesting notice that king Udaya I—this is probably the correct name of the ruler hitherto called Dappula II—caused judgments which were just to be entered in books and kept in the royal palace in order to avoid future violations of justice. Such a collection of judicial decisions, acknowledged in times of old as correct and just, could serve as sure guides for future judges. In the thirteenth century Āyasmanta, the *Senāpati* of queen Kalyānavatī and actual ruler of the kingdom, is said to have compiled a text-book which had law as its subject (*dhammādhikāraṇaṃ satthaṃ*, 80. 41). This was certainly a code of laws.

56. A list of penalties occurs in Mhvs., 83. 4 sq. The mildest one is a pecuniary fine (*daṇḍa*). Next come impri-

sonment in jails (*ḥārāgāra*) and banishment (*raṭṭhā pabbājana*). The most severe penalty was beheading (*sisacheda*). Bodily mutilation as cutting off the nose and toes was also not infrequent. Thus at the end of the first century A. C. King Iṇanāga punished the members of Lambakaṇṇa clan who had opposed his progress (35. 43).

Frequently the punishment was too severe and even cruel. We may infer from 87. 48 that thieves who had committed thefts in the royal palace could be punished with loss of limbs (*aṅgahāni*). Prince Vijayabāhu, afterwards King Vijayabāhu IV, 1271-73, is said to have pardoned such criminals so that their lives were spared.

Kings often used to grant amnesty after a lucky event or when they had ascended the throne. Already in the third century A. C. King Tissa made a law by which bodily injury, that is capital punishment and mutilation, probably also torture, was set aside (*vohāraṇ himsā-muttaṇ*, 36. 28), and received the name of Vohārika-tissa owing to his clemency. The same king also freed *bhikkhus* who were in debt from their indebtedness (36. 39).

Mānābharaṇa, after the birth of his son, the later Parakkamabāhu the Great, set many people free, who lay bound in fetters in prison (62. 42). King Vijayabāhu II, Parakkamabāhu's nephew and successor, when he had received consecration as King, released from their misery those whom his uncle had thrown into prison and tortured with stripes or with fetters (80. 2-3). In the thirteenth century King Parakkamabāhu II granted a general amnesty by reducing all penalties inflicted on criminals (83. 4 sq.). People whose heads were to be cut off were punished only with prison and then set free again. For such people as deserved prison he ordained some lighter punishment. On people who should have been banished from the country he laid but a fine, and those who had deserved a fine he dismissed with a rebuke.

By taking refuge in an *asylum* people who had committed a crime could escape a too hasty and unjust punish-

ment. Such asylums were the Buddhist monasteries. Having been defeated in battle by his brother Duṭṭhagāmaṇi prince Tissa took sanctuary in a monastery (24. 39). According to local tradition it was that of Okkampitiya, East of Buttala. From the story referred to in para 36 we see that violation of the right of sanctuary could lead to a severe conflict between the priesthood and the worldly authorities.

57. *High treason* (*rājāparādha*, Mhvs., 35. 10), that is opposition to the ruling king, was a crime which was punished in the most cruel manner. People who had committed it were called rebels (*corā*, *dāmarikā*). In the first century A. C. by the order of the king sixty *bhikkhus* who were convicted of that crime were flung down a rocky precipice (35. 11). The peculiar penalties of rebels were impalement, hanging or burning alive. At the performance of his father's funeral rites King Jeṭṭhatissa caused the dignitaries who had been hostile to the deceased ruler because of his attachment to a heretical priest, to be slain and their bodies impaled on stakes round the pyre of his father (36. 118-22). Because of this deed he came by the surname 'the Cruel' (*kaḷḷhala*).

These two examples belong to the ancient times. In the mediaeval period three brothers, dignitaries of the highest rank, had become hostile to king Vijayabāhu I. They fled to Southern India and returned to Ceylon about the year 1078 with an army in order to subvert the kingdom. But the king captured his foes in bitter fight and had them impaled (59. 21). By the order of the same king the leaders of the rebellious Vellakāra mercenaries, who had slain their two generals, were burnt alive, chained to stakes around the pyre on which the remnants of the murdered generals were laid (60. 35-43).

At the time of Parakkamabāhu the treatment of the Rohaṇa people was terribly cruel, if we can rely on the report of the chronicler. And the Rohaṇa people were by no means rebels in the true sense of the word, but rather loyal

adherents of their former dynasty represented at that time by the aged queen Sugalā. The Damiḷādhikārin Rakkha after having conquered Dvādasasahassaka (Cf. 41) had many hundreds of the foes, who had been taken alive, impaled in villages and market towns, and also round about the village of Mahānāgahula he had numbers of the foes impaled or hanged on the gallows and burnt to ashes (75. 160-63). Likewise General Mañju had many stakes set up in the Rohaṇa country on which he impaled hundreds of the enemy, and he hanged numbers of other foes on the gallows and burnt (75. 190-92). Thus he showed forth in every way the majesty of King Parakkamabāhu.

*Neubiberg*



## Indo-Javanese Images in Berlin, Amsterdam and London Museums

By F. M. SCHNITGER

In the large museums of Europe are stored numerous images having a great value for Indo-Javanese archaeology and history. One must deplore that up till now many of them are not even known to students. We publish below three photos of such images which were all made in East Java in the 14th or 15th century.

The Ethnographical Museum in Berlin possesses since 1861 a four-armed Śiva, a masterpiece of Javanese sculpture (Pl. I). The god carries a crown, the top of which ends in a lotus-bud. Behind the ears and on the shoulders one sees rich ornaments. On the aureole are hewn out ties and bands. No less than three collars hang down on the breast. The arms are adorned with numerous bands, among which some have the meander-form. Also the thumbs and little-fingers show rings.

The tightly closing loin-cloth is draped in ingenious and graceful folds. From the girdle are hanging down two long bands. An *upavīta* lies over it. A flaming halo surrounds the whole image; on the inner side of this halo are intrenched kidney-shaped notches.

In the backhands the image carries a fly-fan and an *akṣamālā*, which is crowned by a *liṅga*. In the left forearm it carries a large *liṅga* on a lotus; the fingers of the right arm clasp this *liṅga*. This reminds us of the South Indian Liṅgāyats, who bury their dead with a golden *liṅga* in the left hand, a symbol of their *iṣṭadevatā*. The Javanese image is the statue of a dead king.

It strikes us that the head is made very big in comparison to the body. This must be explained by the magic force attributed to it. The eyes are long-shaped and oblique; very uncommon are the moustache and the circular beard, such as we see, on the *bhairava* from Sungei Langsaf in Sumatra. The most striking feature, however, is the wrinkled forehead,



Sica (*Ethnological Museum, Berlin*)



Pl. 2. Statue of a king (*Colonial Museum, Amsterdam*)



Pl. 3. Parvati (*Victoria and Albert Museum, London*)



which gives a menacing aspect to the whole face and makes us ask if this king was perhaps a devotee of the *bhairavas*.

No less fine is the splendid, alas! very damaged, image in the Colonial Museum at Amsterdam (Pl.2). Originally it was four-armed. On the crown are carved out squarish ornaments. From the centre of the diadem is hanging down a little pearl-string. On the shoulders are seen *makara*-heads. The loin-cloth is draped and ornamented somewhat differently from that of the Berlin image; the decoration gives a good impression of the goldsmith's art of the Madjapahit times. On the right and left are pots with lotus-flowers, partly covered with the skirts of the cloth. It appears from the careful workmanship of this image that it must have been the statue of a mighty king set up after his death. It is therefore extremely deplorable that it is so heavily damaged and that we do not know exactly in which place it was found.

The image in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London (Pl.3) shows the same style-characteristics as those from Berlin and Amsterdam. Its execution, however, is far less beautiful. We see here a four-armed *Pārvatī* with a fly-fan in the left upper hand; the right upper hand carries a lotus with a jewel or a *liṅga*. The little-fingers of the hand show a ring, the ring-fingers even two. The fore-hands are folded, the tips of the indexes touch each other, a symbol of the *triṣaṇa* or *yonī*. The crown carries a lotus-bud and is decorated with round ornaments; under the breast is a band. The *upavīta* is composed of three strings. The whole image is surrounded by a flaming halo. On the left and right are standing pots with lotus-flowers and leaf. Striking are the broad jaws of the face, which are characteristic of the inhabitants of Menangkabau in Sumatra. We know that the Javanese king *Kṛtaradjasa* (†1309) was married with a Malay princess. Perhaps this is also the statue of a dead king.

Vienna.

## Some Notes on the Kingdom of Dvāravatī

By H. G. Quaritch Wales, *Field Director of the  
Greater-India Research Committee*

Our knowledge of the ancient Indianized kingdom of Dvāravatī, which attained its height during the VIth and VIIth centuries A. D. and occupied the lower parts of the Mênām and Méklong valleys of Central Siam, is at present based almost entirely on the results of M. Çœdès's important researches in this field. Finds made from time to time at Nāk'on Pāthōm and elsewhere, and the excavations at P'ōng Tū'k<sup>1</sup>, though they have yielded no records of events nor provided us with the names and dates of kings on which to base an outline of the history of the kingdom, have yet given us a tolerably clear idea of the culture of the people, at least during the period of their greatness. But the later centuries of the Dvāravatī period remain veiled in obscurity and a primary object of this article is to suggest a means by which that veil might some day be rent asunder.

Before I come to that, however, I should like to take the opportunity of expressing my views on the question as to whether or not this territory played an important role as a medium for the distribution of Indian cultural influences to the further east, either during the fourth and fifth centuries when it seems to have formed part of the Fu-nan empire, or after the middle of the sixth when it became the independent State of Dvāravatī. When speaking of the magnificent statues of Añkor Bórĕi, which are so closely related to the Gupta sculpture of India, M. Çœdès says: "It is not impossible that this Buddhist art arrived in Cambodia, or rather in Fu-nan, through the intermediary of Dvāravatī.....

1. G. Çœdès, *The Excavations at P'ong Tuk*, *JSS.*, Vol. xxi, pt. 3, 1928

For the Buddhist art of Fu-nan, Dvāravatī has perhaps played the part of intermediary between Gupta India and the Mékong delta."<sup>2</sup>

The difficulty of accepting this view is that the statues found at Aṅkor Bórĕi are so manifestly nearer Indian Gupta models than are any of the numerous Buddhist images showing Gupta relationship that have been found in Central Siam, and they must be placed at least a century earlier in date. There is ample evidence that Indian influences reached the mouth of the Mékong *via* the all-sea route, and afterwards *via* the Tākuapa-C'āiya transpeninsular route, at a very early period. It is difficult therefore to resist the conclusion that these almost purely Indian sculptures from Aṅkor Bórĕi are the expression of influences brought to Cambodia *via* one of the more direct colonial routes just mentioned.

On the other hand the Dvāravatī sculptures of Central Siam are without exception definitely stylised, if not decadent. They must be looked upon as the final expression of a more northerly stream of Indian culture that had probably already passed through its period of active development in the Môn country of Lower Burma before, penetrating eastwards *via* the Three Pagoda and Papun routes, it exhausted itself on the rich plains of Central Siam. In the neighbourhood of the Prāchin valley, towards the border between modern Siam and Cambodia, these two cultural streams must have established contact and no doubt cultural exchanges took place; but it is difficult to imagine that cultural influences that had travelled *via* Burma, the mountain passes, and finally the wide plains of Dvāravatī, so far from their original Indian home-land, could have retained vigour and purity of conception enough to produce the superb statuary of Aṅkor Bórĕi. But if the influence of Dvāravatī culture on the growing Khmèr civilization was probably small, its importance for the future of Siam was great; and

2. *Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam*, pt. ii. p. 4; also *Ars Asiatica*, vol. xii, p. 23.

this brings me to the consideration of the obscure later centuries of the kingdom of Dvāravatī.

During the XIIth and XIIIth centuries the Khmèr empire extended its sway over the territory of Dvāravatī, and buildings of provincial Khmèr style were erected at almost all the cities of the Dvāravatī kingdom that had survived until that time. In the XIIIth century, with the break-up of the Khmèr empire, the Thai State of Sūkhot'āi spread its power southward over all this region. But its suzerainty was short-lived, and in 1350 A.D. we find a large part of Central Siam dominated by a Prince of U T'ông, a city situated some fifty miles west of Ayūth'ya on what was then the main Sūp'ān river but is now an insignificant tributary. H. R. H. Prince Damrong, who visited the place in 1904, placed on record<sup>3</sup> the legend that in 1350 A. D. the Prince of U T'ông, fleeing from an epidemic, deserted the city and marched westward to the Menam where he founded the city of Ayūth'ya which was for more than four hundred years to be the capital of a united kingdom of Siam. Not only is the name Dvāravatī one of the titles by which Ayūth'ya came to be known, but Prince Damrong was able to establish a definite connection between U T'ông and the Dvāravatī culture when he found statues and coins of exactly the same type that had previously been found at Nāk'on Pāthōm. It seems very likely that U T'ông was one of the old cities of the Dvāravatī kingdom, which, on account of its remote situation, had retained much of its early Hinayāna Buddhist culture at the expense of a nominal vassalage to the Khmèrs. Later, having got rid of its Khmèr, and finally of its Sūkhot'āi Thai overlords, it was able to re-establish its independence.

There is good reason for believing that the early civilizers of the Dvāravatī kingdom were Indianized Môn colonists from Lower Burma, but the fact that the Prince of U T'ông was himself a Thai need cause no surprise. The

3. *The Foundation of Ayudhya*, in *JSS.*, Vol. i, p. 7.

local legend maintains that his family had comparatively recently migrated from the North; and if that is so they were members of one of the later waves of Thai immigration. But recent researches<sup>4</sup> suggest that the Thai had become established in Central Siam at a much earlier period than had formerly been supposed and the Thai of U T'ông had no doubt absorbed their Môn civilisers centuries before this city was deserted. I have mentioned that the Buddhist images found at U T'ông by Prince Damrong were of the Dvāravatī style, and hence it is necessary to note M. Çœdès's explanation for denominating as "School of U T'ông" a number of sculptures found not actually at U T'ông, but at other cities in Central Siam, and showing mixed Dvāravatī, Khmèr and Sūkhot'āi characteristics. M. Çœdès justifies this classification on the grounds that many of these sculptures may well date from the early part of the fourteenth century, before Ayūth'ya had been founded and when U T'ông dominated the region. U T'ông, indeed, during the later centuries of its existence, could scarcely be expected to have escaped the varied cultural influences that must have been brought to bear on what remained of the Dvāravatī kingdom, and this is certainly supported by the presence of several stone Hindu figures of rather mixed ancestry still to be seen in the neighbourhood of U T'ông.

Following the useful pointers extended by Prince Damrong and M. Çœdès I myself visited U T'ông early in 1936. While my visit was too short to do justice to the site, it had the effect of still further stimulating my interest. The city is a rectangular enclosure measuring about a mile from north to south and half that distance from east to west. It is bounded by a moat and mound and the area within is largely occupied by thin jungle broken by extensive bare patches where little vegetation seems able to grow. Outside the city are one or two brick *stūpas* the style of which

4. *Tal Pottery* by P'raya Nakon P'rah Ram in *JSS.*, Vol. xxix, pt. i, 1936; also *Further Excavations at P'ong Tūk*, by H. G. Q. Wales in *Ind. Art and Letters*, Vol. X. No. 1, 1936.



indicates that they probably date from not much earlier than the thirteenth century. Within the enclosure there are the remains of only one monument, an old *stūpa* basement, situated at the centre of the city. This basement was itself constructed from large re-employed bricks, many of them ornamented with whorls, which must have once formed part of a much earlier structure. At a spirit shrine in the neighbouring Chinese village I was shown a stucco head, said to have been dug up near some *stūpa* in the neighbourhood. The features were of exactly the same type as those of many of the heads found at Nāk'on Pāthōm and believed to date from the VIth or VIIth century.

There had been several thunderstorms at U T'ông at the time of my visit and the rain had washed out large quantities of small objects from the surface soil of the open spaces that occupied so much of the city enclosure. Besides household utensils and pottery we found the crucibles of metal workers often associated with lumps of base metal and a few specks of gold. Moreover agate, cornelian, crystal and garnet beads mainly of Indian type were found in great abundance and here and there were uncremated human bones. These objects were lying on the sites of the houses of the last inhabitants of U T'ông and, while it is true that beads often tend to work to the surface, the evidence seems to offer some support for the legend which tells us that the city had to be hastily abandoned as the result of an epidemic. A few more objects of interest were produced by the villagers who said they were accustomed to search over the city site whenever heavy rain had washed over the soil. Among these objects were several gold rings, a golden ear-ring set with polished rubies and a large primitive bullet coin, stamped with lion, elephant and *cakṛa* marks, of the type designated "pre-Ayuthian" by Dr. Le May.<sup>5</sup>

5. *The Coinage of Siam*, in *JSS.*, vol. xviii, 1924, Pl. 1, 3.

I decided to dig two or three trial trenches at different points on these open spaces, in order to determine whether the place would be likely to repay complete excavation at some future date. The deposits proved to be very definitely stratified with several clearly differentiated occupation levels each marked by a refuse of fragments of fish and animal bones, shells, pottery fragments and layers of charcoal, the remains of ancient kitchen-middens. No human bones were found at these levels, and beads only rarely. The most interesting point, however, was that while a whole C'ālieng jar was found only a foot beneath the surface, fragments of this ware were found as much as seven feet thereunder. Below this level fragments of coarse earthenware only were found, down to a depth of about eleven feet at which depth natural soil seemed nearly to have been reached. While absolute depth of finds is in itself of course no criterion, it is certainly remarkable that C'ālieng ware should have been found seven feet down in a city the great age of which is suggested by the images of Dvāravatī style that have been found there. Until recently it was not supposed that glazed pottery was made in Siam much before the XIIth or XIIIth century, but the depth at which these C'ālieng fragments were found at U T'ōng must now be considered in conjunction with the evidence adduced by P'āya Nāk'on P'rah Ram to the effect that C'ālieng pottery was made from A. D. 500 to A. D. 1374<sup>6</sup>.

For the present it would obviously be premature to attempt to build further on our scant knowledge of the remains at U T'ōng. But the fact that at more than one level ancient brick courses were encountered in my trial trenches suggests that thorough excavation might not only tell us much about the everyday domestic life of the people, but that the foundations of brick temples, perhaps with sculptures and even inscriptions, might very well be brought to light. Indeed, now that P'ong Tū'k seems to have been

6. *Loc. cit.*, p. 23.

more or less exhausted, and most of the other known Dvāravatī sites are not available for excavation either by reason of their sanctity or their being modern centres of civilisation, the possibilities of U T'ông deserve careful attention, not only for the additional light that the excavation of that city might throw on the heyday of Dvāravatī culture, but because it might serve to illumine the whole history of Central Siam, right from the beginning of the Dvāravatī kingdom until the end of those later obscure centuries at the close of which the torch was handed on to the new kingdom of Ayūth'ya. To the careful investigator U T'ông should make a strong appeal by reason of the clearly stratified nature of its deposits which have not attracted, and are not likely to attract, the attention of the treasure-seekers who have harmed so many other sites in Siam. The complete excavation of U T'ông would be no small undertaking and should not be undertaken lightly; but it is probably one of the most important of the tasks that lie before the archaeologist of the future in Siam.

## Copper-Plates of Kĕmbang Arum 824 Śaka

By HIMANSU BHUSAN SARKAR

These three copper-plates were discovered from a cane-field of *desa* Kĕmbang Arum in the sub-division of the same name, district Klegung, Sleman, Jogjakarta. The plates are of similar size and measure  $4\frac{1}{2} \times 18.5$  c.m. Of these three plates, I and II are incised on one side, while III is written on both the faces.

The inscription contains two records. The first record dates from 824 Śaka and states that the *rakryan* of Wantil (*viz.*) *Pu* Pālaka, resident of Wuatan sugih, with his wife *dyah* Prasāda and his three sons (*viz.*) *Pu* Palaku, *Pu* Gowinda and *Pu* Wangi tamuy marked out a free-hold at Panggumulan for the god and the goddess at Kinawuhan. The second record dating from 825 Śaka states that the *rakryan* of Wantil (*viz.*) *Pu* Pālaka with his wife *dyah* Prasāda and three sons (*viz.*) *Pu* Palaku, *Pu* Gowinda and *dyah* Wangi tamuy purchased the mortgaged lands of the *rāmanta*-s of Panggumulan. The garden named Sidhayoga and the *sawah*-fields of Panilman were bought for silver 3 *kati* from *ḍapunta* Prabhu and *ḍapunta* Kaca.

Dr. Bosch has published the transcription of this inscription with elaborate notes in *OV*, 1925, Bijl. B, pp. 41-49.

### TEXT.

- I. 1. swasti śakawarṣātita 824, pauṣa māsa tithi daśamī<sup>1</sup>  
kr̥ṣṇapakṣa, tunglai, kaliwuan, somawāra, dakṣiṇas-  
tha<sup>2</sup>, jaiṣṭhanakṣatra<sup>3</sup>, mitradewatā, sukarmmāyoga,  
tatkāla rakryān
2. i wantil pu pālaka anak wanua i wuatan sugih watak  
wulakan<sup>•</sup>, muang nganakwi nira dyah prasāda, muang

1. Read : °mī.

2. Read : °kṣi°.

3. Read : jyēṣṭhā°.

anak nira katiga pu palaku, pu gowinda, pu wangi  
tamuy manusuk śīma<sup>4</sup> mawanua i pa

3. nggumulan watak puluwatu hop.....<sup>5</sup> kabikuanya  
gaway mā 4 sawah kanayakān tampah 7 kaṭik 1 patilek  
ning alas pirak mā 1 paknānyan sinusuk punyā nira  
śīmā
4. bhaṭāra muang bhaṭārī i kinawuhan, tan katamāna  
dening saprakāra ning mangilala drabya haji tikasan,  
rumwān, manimpiki, paranakan, kring paḍammapuy,  
manghuri, air haji, tapa haji,
5. tuha dagang, wanua i dalam, katanggaran, pinilai,  
mapaḍahi mangidung, hulun haji ityewamadi kabaih  
tan hana deyan tumamā iriya, bhaṭāra muang bhaṭārī  
atah basa pramāṇā
6. ing sowara ni sukha duhkanya kabaih anung kinon  
humarapa<sup>6</sup> ikanang susukan śīma sang pamagat pikatan  
ḍapunta koṣikī anak wanua ing haji kabikuan i pamē-  
hangan, muang sang pa
7. magat manungkuli sang brahmāsakti, mangasiakan  
sira pasēk pasēk sabyawastha<sup>7</sup> ning manusuk śīma  
dangū, i rakryan mapatih i hino pu dakṣa sang bāhu-  
bajrapratipakṣakṣaya, rake halu pu
8. bwalu sang sanggrāmadurandhara, rakai sirikan pu  
wariga sang samarabikrānta, rakai wka pu kutak, rake  
pagarwsi pu wīrabikrama, sang pamagat tiruan pu  
asangā sang śīwa astra, sang makawanua ika
9. na sinusuk sang pamagat puluwatu pu kunir sang  
winīta anak wanua i cukulan watak tilimpik, kapua sira  
inasēan pasēk pasēk wḍihan gañjar pātra sisi yu 1  
sisim<sup>8</sup> pasada<sup>9</sup>
10. woh 1 mabrat mas su 1 ing sowang sowang || sang  
puluwatu anakbi pu babi anak wanua i babahan i

4. The word has variously been spelt in this inscription.

5. Five letters are illegible. [Bosch.]

6. Generally we read : °repa.

7. Read : °wyawasthā.

8. Elsewhere we find : simsi°.

9. In some inscriptions we read : prasāda, prāsāda.

- puluwatu inasian<sup>10</sup> kain sawlah sisim pasada woh l<sup>11</sup>  
mabrat mas mā 8 || rakai
11. halaran pu basu, rake palarhyang pu puñjang, elinan<sup>12</sup>.  
pu gālatha, wlahan pu dhepu, manghuri pu cakra,  
pangkur pu rañjan, tawān pu warā, tirip pu kṛṣṇa,  
wadihati pu ḍapit, ma
12. kudur pu sambrada, kapua sira inasēan pasēk pasēk  
wḍihan rangga yu l sisim pasada woh l mabrat mas mā  
8 ing sowang sowang || paminang i sang hyang kudur  
wḍihan yu l mas mā 4
13. sang tuhān ni wadihati 2 sang miramirah si rayung  
mangrangkapi sang halaran si rahula anak wanua i  
pangramuan watak wadihati, sang tuhār ni makudur 2  
sang asammanjang<sup>13</sup> si dharmma muang sang tangkil
14. sugih, si manikṣa anak wanua i mantyasih watak  
makudur, kapua wineh pasēk pasēk wḍihan yu l mas mā  
4 ing sowang sowang || i wadihati lumaku manusuk  
sang wurukuy si managa
15. sū anak wanua i paṇḍamuan wadihati, muang i ma-  
kudur sang kamalagyan si lalita anak wanua i palikēt  
watak makudur kapua winaih pasēk pasēk wḍihan yu 2  
mas mā 8 ka
- 16 hop pā pangangkat ing sowang sowang || samangkana  
sang tuhān mamuat ujar kabaih panujar<sup>14</sup> ri hino sang  
kaṇḍamuhi si tunggang anak wanua i gununggan watak  
tangkil citralekha sang watu warani
- II. 1. si manēsēr anak wanua i tamalinggang watak siri-  
kan parujar ri halu sang wisaga<sup>15</sup> si wīryya anak wanua  
i pakalangkyangan watak pagarwsi, parujar i sirikan  
sang hujung galuh si agra anak wanu

10. In some places of contemporary inscriptions, the writers have indifferently used *i* and *e* for *y* when this last one is joined with a previous letter.

11. Bosch's reading of *i* is evidently due to a printing mistake.

12. dali°? cf. *TBG*, 67, p. 183, f.n. 23.

13. Elsewhere: asampañ°.

14. Read: paru°.

15. Bosch reads °maga, which is evidently a mistake.

2. a i singha watak hino, citralekha dharmmasinta si parbwata anak wanua i limusā watak puluwatu, parujar i wka wiridih si daṇunwe i skar tan<sup>16</sup> watak layuwatang, citralekha halang
3. manuk si gowinda wanwa ri wanua tngah watak wurutunggal parujar i tiruan sumuḍan si kasura anak wanua i wungkuḍu watak kilipan, kapua awinaih pasēk pasēk wḍihan yu 1 ma
4. s mā 4 ing sowang sowang || parujar i halaran sang wijanta anak wanua i talumpuk i sumingkar watak kaṇḍuh tuhā ni kanayakān i puluwatu si samadhi wanwa i pangaruhan paṇḍai tamwaga
5. muang tuhā ning lampuran si dhaniti anak wanua i wukulan watak tilimpik parujar i manghuri sang ranubra si samodaya anak wanua i singhapura watak halu manghi, parujar i pangkur
6. udalan<sup>17</sup> si dhyāna anak wanua i rilam watak aluhur, parujar i tawān sang ḍaluk si kṛṣṇa anak wanua i srai watak lampungan, parujar i tirip sang pangadagan si singhā
7. anak wanua i parangmangjahijjahit kapua wineh pasēk pasēk wḍihan yu 1 mas mā 2 ing sowang sowang || pitungtung ni parujar sang mānak, lua si barubuh muang si waru kapua anakwanua
8. i ralua watak wurutunggal, wuatan yai si kbēl anak wanua i wuatan yai watak watu humalang wineh pasēk pasēk wḍihan yu 1 mā 1 ing sowang sowang || patih i puluwatu 3
9. mā mas si tirisan rama ni yoga muang tajyangin si kaṇḍi rama ni lucira, tunggūdurungnya si śaraṇa rama ni wawul kapua wineh pasēk pasēk wḍihan yu 1 mas mā 2 ing sowang sowang ||
10. parujar i patih i kañcil rama ni waṇḍi wineh wḍihan sahle mas mā 1 || wahuta i puluwatu 3 airhajo<sup>18</sup> si dras

16. tahuṇ? [Bosch].

17. Dedelan occurs in this place in other inscriptions.

18. airhaji?

- rama ni waringin, tunggūdurungnya si baiśakha rama ni tumwa, wahuta winka
11. s wkas si katis wineh pasēk pasēk wḍihan yu 1 mas mā 2 ing sowang sowang || wahuta lampuran si bhadra muang pihujungnya prāṇa 5 kapua winaih pasēk pasēk wḍihan
  12. sahle mas mā 1 ing sowang sowang || rāma māgaman irikanang wanua sinusuk i panggumulan prāṇa 6 kalang manguwu si pingul rama ni udā, gusti syatag rama ni rangga, winkas si wu
  13. dal rama ni ḍemoh tuha banua si guṇa rama ni ḍay-ang, rāma matuha si wlang rama ni go, magawai watu śīma si śrū rama ni bukaṅ sangkā i dihyang wineh pasēk pasēk wḍihan yu 1
  14. mas mā 2 ing sowang sowang || muwah māgaman prāṇa 7 kalang tunggūdurung si tuḍe rama ni bhaiśākha, hulu wras ḍapunta bingung, tuha wērēh si brit si kpul rama ni mahēar wadahu
  15. ma 2 si plat rama ni dharmma, muang si uñja rama ni gamwoh si ḍoho rama ni ramya si ranggēl, rama ni tugaṅ, si kaladhara rama ni udāyaṇa si māngoh rama ni tarum kapua winaih pasēk pasēk
  16. k wḍihan yu 1 mas mā 1 ing sowang sowang || anak manuam prāṇa 18 si bloṇḍo, si karan, si uyaṇa, si plat, si muga, si kuṇḍu, si glo, sy alēng, si bahu, si glar
  17. si limbu, si tunggū, si tiḍu, si gwari, si kawēl, si balubu, si bngal, si drawēng, kapua winaih pasēk pasēk wḍihan sahlai mas ku 1 ing sowang sowang || rainanta sang matuha, si turuk rainangga
  18. si taḍah raibai, si rumpung rai ḍaimoh winaih pasēk pasēk kain wlah 1 kampit 1 ing sowang sowang || muwah rainanta sang manūti prāṇa 15 si gawī rai kṛṣṇa, si magya rai śryan si kuḍuk rai
- III. a. 1. rāmpūan si wrut rai tugaṅ, si kinang rai barubuh, si dakī rai mahēar, si turukan rai tarum, si haryya rai ramya, si balyah rai gamwo, si puñjang rai gamwais, si lamyat rai banī, si ḍayang rai dayana



2. si dita rai bireḍis, si kutil rai go, si tugaṇ rai wdai  
piṇḍaprāṇa 15 winaih pasḥk pasḥk kain sawlah ing  
sowang sowang || anak manuam anakbi si mahyang,  
si tagḥs, si rikha, si sojara, si wi
3. doh, si rampwas, si kaḍya, si camma piṇḍaprāṇa  
8 wineh pasḥk pasḥk pirak mā 4 ing sowang sowang ||  
samangkana sang i siringan ing wanua milu pinaka-  
sākṣi, patih i hino patih kulumpang si puñjang
4. rama ni śrī, patih i tiru rāṇu 2 patih paṇḍawutan  
si pryangka rama ni kurutug muang si parama rama  
ni wulakan kapua wineh pasḥk pasḥk wḍihan yu 1 mas  
mā 2 ing sowang sowang || rāma i siringan tumū
5. tsākṣi, i suru watak ho<sup>19</sup> kalangnya si pagar kaki  
mahū, parujarnya si tahil rama ni waris, i tguhan  
watak linggang gusti si sunglit rama ni ptḥng, paru-  
jarnya si hali rangma ni jaluk, i purud watak paran-  
tunga
6. n paṇḍe kalang si taji rama ni swāmi, parujarnya si  
junḥt, i pāstamwir kalang si guṇakāra rama ni jaluk,  
parujarnya syungḍa rama ni kisik, i kinawuhan watak  
hino gusti si bandeng kaki aji, parujarnya
7. si tuḍu, i wangun amwḥk watak panguruhan paṇḍe  
rāma matuha si pyul rama ni śuddhi parujarnya si  
julung i munggu wuatan watak laṇḍa tamwir rama  
matuha si waduā rama ni impḥn piṇḍa wanua si
8. ringan tumūt pinakasākṣi 9 hos<sup>20</sup> sang patih wuangnya  
prāṇa 9 kapua winaih pasḥk pasḥk wḍihan yu 1 mas mā  
2 ing sowang sowang || parujarnya piṇḍa prāṇa 6 winaih  
pasḥk pasḥk wḍihan
9. sahlai mas mā 1 ing sowang sowang || saji ning  
manusuk śima wḍihan sang hyang brahmā yu 1 mas  
mā 1 wḍihan sang hyang kulumpang yu 4 mas mā 4  
wadung 1 rimwas 1 patuk 1 lukai 1 twḥk punukan 1
10. linggis 4 laṇḍuk 1 wangkyul 1 gulumi 1• kurumbhagi  
1 nakhaccheda 1 dom 1 tahas 1 bsi 1 padamaran 1

- saragi pagangan 2 kampil 1 wras sakadut 1 wsi ikat 1 wdus 1 taṇḍas<sup>21</sup> ||
11. kumol 1 skul dinyun 4 pras 1 pasilih galuh 1 argha<sup>22</sup> 5 wras ing tamwakur 1 hayam 4 hantiga 4 muang pañcopacāra kamwang, kawittha, dīpa, dhupa, gandhalepa || i sampunira kabaih mana
  12. dah mapangalih makawittha, makamwang malungguh sira ring natar makulilingan humarapakan<sup>23</sup> sang hyang kudur muang sang hyang śīma watu lulumpang<sup>24</sup> i sor ning bitana i tngah ning natar, krama ning malungguh
  13. sang pamagat pikatan, rake wantila, samagat manungkuli umanggu lor humarap<sup>25</sup> kidul, sang wahuta hyang kudur muang sang tuhan memuat wuwus kabaih munggu kuluan humarap waitan, sang
  14. sang wahuta patih muang ramanta muang sang anak wanua kabaih tpi siring munggu kidul humarap lor lumakas sang makudur mamangmang manumpah, manapatai,<sup>25</sup> manatōk<sup>26</sup> gulū ni hayam lina
  15. ṇḍasakan ing susu kulumpang, mamatingakan hantlū i sang hyang watu śīma, manggnuangi sang hyang brahmā ring susu, kadyanggānikang hayam pjah tan
    - waluy mahurip, kadi lwir nikang hantlū rēmoeḥ śata-śirṇa<sup>27</sup> kadi parṇa.
  16. sang hyang brahmā tumunu bra ikang kayu saka gōgōngan hilang gēsōng tan pahambān hawu kerir, mangkanā ikanang uang nganyaya asing umulaulah iki wanwa i panggumulan sinīma rakai wantil sinū
  17. suk ning kudur muang waduā rakryan mapatih mangkana sawata<sup>28</sup> sang makudur anung karēngō de sang wahuta patih muang sang rāma anak wanua

21. Bosch misread it as Ka°. Ta° occurs in many inscriptions at this place. •

22. Read : °ghya.

23. Generally we find, : °rep.

25. Read • °pathai.

27. Read °ṇa.

24. Read : kulu°.

26. Read : °ne°.

28. Read : śapatha.

kabaih nguniwaih sang tpi siring kabaih manamwah ya  
i sang hyang watu śīma

18. kulumpang sumamwahakan bhaktinya muang i tan  
langghanānya mangkananya umuwah sira kabaih i ron  
nira manadāh lwir na tinadāh kakap daing kadawas<sup>29</sup>  
ruma
  19. han layar layar hurang, halahala, hantiga, sasamang-  
kanang pinakagangan haḍangan prāṇa 2 wḍus 1 dina-  
dyakan klakla samenaka amwillamwil,<sup>30</sup> kasyan, kwōlan,  
piningkā, ginanganan
  20. hana rumwarumwah, kuluban, duḍutan tetis, mang-  
kanang madya ininung hana twak siddhu, hana jāti-  
rasa, dūh ninyung, samangkanang inigōllakan<sup>31</sup> hana  
mapadahi marōggang si catu rama ni kriyā, mabṛēkuk si
- III. b. 1. warā rama ni goga winaih wḍihan sahlai mas  
mā 1 ing sowang sowang || mūlapañjut 4 si ma rama ni  
kutil, si mangol si sāgara si mandon winaih mas mā  
1 ing sowang sowang, mūla wulō
2. si māri winaih mas ku 1 si paracan mabañol winaih  
pirak mā 4 mahawān madwal wras kahaḍang kuma-  
liwat irikang kāla wuang i tunggalangan marā ing pkan  
i siṇḍingan prāṇa 4 si a
  3. ntyan si rampal si surat syaranī tulung tutu i tiru  
ranu wuang i sarupsu prāṇa 3 si biddhi si kyaing si  
goḍa winaih pirak ku 1<sup>31</sup> ing sowang sowang mamangan  
manginung sang patih wahuta muang
  4. ramanta rainanta muang nganak wanua kabaih  
lakilaki waduan matuha rarai milu mahantyan tan  
hana kantun kapua mamangan manginum mangigal  
kapua umtuakan inak ni amwōk nira nāha
  5. n byaktanyan sampun śuddhapariśuddha mapatōh  
ikang wanua i panggumulan watak puluwatu sinusuk  
sang wahuta hyang kudur muang sang tuhan mamuat  
ujar kabaih śīma rakryan i wantil pu pālaka.

29. Read: °di°.

30. Bosch's reading of *i* is evidently *de* to a printing mistake.

31. The duplication of *l* appears to be due to its contamination with the following vowel.

6. muang anakwi nira dyah prasāda muang anak nira  
pu palaku pu gowinda pu wangi tamuy punya nira i  
bhaṭāra muang bhaṭāri i kinawahan pahatguhan tka  
ing laha<sup>32</sup> ning laha,<sup>32</sup> yā suanyana wuang nganyaya a
7. sing umulah iki śima wanua i panggumulan watak  
puluwatu nguniwaih yan susuttaya<sup>33</sup>kadi lawas sang  
hyang candrāditya hana ring ngākāśa sumuluh hing  
aṇḍabhuwana<sup>34</sup>mangkana lawasnyan sangguhang
8. pañcamahāpātaka, anurat praśasti wə<sup>+</sup>uwarani dhar-  
mmasinta halang manuk || O || swasti śakawarṣatita<sup>35</sup>825  
māsa bhadrawāda<sup>36</sup>caturtha<sup>37</sup>kṛṣṇapakṣa wuruku(ng)  
kaliwu
9. an soma wāra tatkāla rakryan i wantil lakibi pu  
pūlaka sang nganakwi dyah prasāda muang anak nira  
katlu pu palaku, pu gowinda, dyah wangi tamuy,  
tumbus<sup>38</sup>
10. Imah rāmanta i panggumulan ikanang kasaṇḍā  
kabuan mangaran i siddhayoga, muang sawah ing pa-  
nilman tinumwas pirak kā 3 i ḍapunta prabhu
11. muang ḍapunta kaca, tumarima ikanang pirak, sang  
tuha kalang i panggumulan si tuḍai rama ni be, sang  
gusti si bloṇḍo, winkas si wudōl rāma ni
12. ḍaimoh rāma marata pu dharmma, pu ramaṇi, si  
uñju, si tiḍu, sang hulu wras si ratnī jātata<sup>39</sup>si sunī,  
tatra sāksi<sup>40</sup>sang marhyang sang dakṣiṇa ḍapunta  
mūrtti, pasingir si go rama ni kucū, ḍapunta tiwī,  
likhita sang karamwa

## TRANSLATION

- I. 1. Hail! The Śaka year expired, 824, the month of  
Pauṣa, tenth day of the dark half of the month, *Tunglai*,<sup>40a</sup>

32. • Read : dla°.

33. One t is superfluous.

34. Read : °wana.

35. Read ṣā°

36. The correct Skt. form is : bhādrapada.

37. In Skt. one should expect : °thī.

38. Read : °bas.

39. Jātaka?

40. Read : °Kṣi.

40a. A Mal.-Polynesian day of the six-day week.

*Kaliwon*,<sup>41</sup> Monday, (the planet) in the southern region, (while) the lunar mansion Jyesthā (stood under) the deity Mitra, (during) the conjunction of Sukarmmā. At that time, the *rakryan*

2. of wantil (viz.) *Pu Pālaka*, resident of Wuatan Sugih under Wulakan, with his wife *dyah* Prasāda and his three sons (viz.) *Pu Palaku*, *Pu Gowinda*, *Pu Wangi* tamuy marked out a free-hold in the village of
3. Panggumulan under Puluwatu.....Its cloister *gaway* 4 *māṣa*, the *sawah*-fields under the united body of the *nāyaka*-s (measuring) *tampah* 7 *katik* 1 (and) plots (?) of the forest (valued at ?) silver 1 *māṣa* are destined to be marked out for their religious merit as a free-hold for the
4. god and the goddess of Kinawuhan. (This) may not be trod upon by all sorts of 'collectors of royal dues', *tikasan*, *rumwān*, *manimpiki*, *paranakan*, *kring*, *paḍa-mapuy*, *manghuri*, *air haji*, *tapahaji*,
5. *tuha dagang*, *wanua i dalam*,<sup>42</sup> *katanggaran*, *pini(ng)-lai*, *mapaḍahi*, *mangidung*, *hulun haji* and so forth. All (these) may have no occasion to tread upon this (free-hold). The god and the goddess have the sole words of authority
6. over all of its good and bad incidents (which may happen in the free-hold). Those who were requested to go before at the foundation of the free-hold were *sang pamagat* Pikatan (who is) the *ḍapunta* Kośikī, resident of the royal cloister (*haji kabikuan*) at Paməhangan, and *sang pamagat*
7. Manungkuli (who is) *sang* Brahmāsakti. They presented gifts in ample measure according to the custom of marking out free-holds in early times. So, the *rakryan mapatih* of Hino (viz.) *pu* Dakṣa bāhubajra-pratipakṣakṣaya, the *raka* of Halu (viz.) *pu*

41. A Mal.-Polynesian day of the five-day week.

42. Apparently a class of people.

8. Bwalu Sanggrāmad(h)urandhara, the *raka* of Sirikan (*viz.*) *Pu* Wariga samarabikrānta, the *raka* of Wka (*viz.*) *Pu* Kutak, the *raka* of Pagarwsi (*viz.*) *Pu* Wira-bikrama, *sang pamagat* Tiruan (*viz.*) *Pu* Asangā śiwa astra, the one who marked out the village as a freehold (*viz.*)
9. *sang pamagat* Puluwatu (who is) *Pu* Kunir winīta, resident of Cukulan under Tilimpik: all of them received in ample measure 1 set of *gañjar pātra sisi* cloth (and) 1 *pasada woh* ring
10. weighing gold 1 *suwarṇa*, each in particular. The wife of *sang (pamagat)* Puluwatu (*viz.*) *pu* Babi, resident of Babahan under Puluwatu received 1 piece of skirt (and) 1 *pasada woh*-ring weighing gold 8 *māṣa*. The *raka*
11. of Halaran (*viz.*) *Pu* Basu, the *raka* of Palarhyang (*viz.*) *pu* Puñjang, the *elinan*<sup>43</sup> (*dalinan*?) (*viz.*) *Pu* Gālatha, the *wlahan* (*viz.*) *Pu* Dhepu, the *manghuri* (*viz.*) *Pu* Cakra, the *pangkur* (*viz.*) *Pu* Rañjan, the *tawān* (*viz.*) *Pu* Warā, the *tirip* (*viz.*) *Pu* Kṛṣṇa, the *wadihati* (*viz.*) *Pu* Dapit, the *makudur*
12. (*viz.*) *Pu* Sambrada: all of them received in ample measure coloured cloth 1 set (and) 1 *pasada woh*-ring weighing gold 8 *māṣa*, each in particular. || The *pamihang*<sup>43</sup> of *sang hyang kudur* (received) cloth 1 set (and) gold 4 *māṣa*.
13. The two *tuhān*-s of the *wadihati*: *sang miramirah* (*viz.*) *Si* Rayung (and) *mangrangkpi halaran* (*viz.*) *Si* Rahula, resident (s) of Pangramuan under Wadihati; the two *tuhān*-s of the *makudur*: *sang asamañjang* (*viz.*) *Si* Dharmma and *sang tangkil*
14. *sugih* (*viz.*) *Si* Manikṣa, resident(s) of Mantyasih under Makudur: all (of them) received in ample measure cloth 1 set (and) gold 4 *māṣa*, each in particular. || The *lumaku manusuk* of Wadihati: *sang wurukuy*<sup>44</sup> (*viz.*) *Si* Managasū,

43. His functions are not known.

15. resident of Paṇḍamuan (under) Wadihati, and the *lumaku manusuk* of Makudur: *sang kamalagyan*<sup>44</sup> (viz.) Si Lalita, resident of Palikēt under Makudur: all (of them) received in ample measure cloth 2 sets (and) gold 8 *māṣa*, in all,
16. (along with) their respective *pangangkat(s)* (?).<sup>45</sup> || Even so, all the (officers called) *tuhān mamuat ujar*<sup>46</sup>: the *parujar-s* of Hino: *sang kaṇḍamuhi* (viz.) Si Tunggang, resident of Gunungan under Tangkil, (and) the *citralekha*<sup>47</sup>: *watu warani*
- II. 1. (viz.) Si Manōśēr, resident of Tamalinggang under Sirikan; the *parujar* of Halu: *sang wisaga* (viz.) Si Wiryya, resident of Pakalangkyangan under Pagar wsi; the *parujar-s* of Sirikan: *sang hujung galuh*<sup>48</sup> (viz.) Si Agra,
2. resident of Singha under Hino, (and) *citralekha*: *dharmmasinta* (viz.) Si Parbwata, resident of Limusā under Puluwatu; the *parujar-s* of Wka: *wiridih* (viz.) Si Daṇunwe, (resident) of Skar tan under Layuwatang, (and) *citralekha*: *halang*
3. *manuk* (viz.) Si Gowinda, of the village of Wanua tngnah under Wurutunggal; the *parujar* of Tiruan: *sumudan* (viz.) Si Kasura, resident of Wungkuḍu<sup>49</sup> under Kilipan: all (of them) received in ample measure cloth 1 set (and) gold
4. 4 *māṣa*, each in particular. || The *parujar* of Halaran (viz.) Sang Wijanta, resident of Talumpuk in Suming-

44. I have provisionally accepted it as a title.

45. The term also occurs elsewhere. cf. OJO XXII: 13-14; XLIII: v° 4, etc. Its ordinary meaning does not appear to be acceptable here.

46. They are the same as *tuhān mamuat wuwus*. They are officers and, under the name of *parujar*, form an important group among the recipients. They appear, however, to belong to a lower category of officers subordinate to the high dignitaries. cf. OV., 1925, p. 48.

47. Designer.

48. However see Rouffaer in BKL, 77 (1921) p. 364 and Sarkar, *Dacca University Studies*, I, p. 119. f.n. 1.

49. Dr. Stutterheim (TBG., 67, pp. 182-183) brings this place-name into connexion with Wungkulur of Nāg: 77, 3: 1-4.

- kar under Kaṇḍuh; the *tuha* of the united body of the *nayaka*-s of Puluwatu (*viz.*) *Si* Samadhi, of the village of Pangaruhan; the copper-smith
5. and *tuhā* of Lampuran (*viz.*) *Si* Dhaniti, resident of Wukulan under Tilimpik; the *paruḥjar* of Manghuri: *sang ranubra*<sup>50</sup> (*viz.*) *Si* Samodaya, resident of Singhapura<sup>51</sup> under Halu manghi; the *paruḥjar* of Pangkur:
  6. *dēdēlan* (*viz.*) *Si* Dhyāna, resident of Rilam under Aluhur; the *paruḥjar* of Tawān: *sang ḍaluk*<sup>1</sup> (*viz.*) *Si* Kṛṣṇa, resident of Srai under Lampungān; the *paruḥjar* of Tirip: *sang pangadagan*<sup>1</sup> (*viz.*) *Si* Singhā,
  7. resident of Parangmangjahijjahit: all (of them) received in ample measure cloth 1 set (and) gold 2 *māṣa*, each in particular. || The *pitungtung*-s of the *paruḥjar* of Mānak: the *lua*<sup>1</sup>-s (*viz.*) *Si* Barubuh and *Si* Waru, all residents
  8. of Ralua under Wurutunggal; (the *pitungtung* of the *paruḥjar* of) Wuatan yai (*viz.*) *Si* Kbəl, resident of Wuatan yai under Watu humalang; (these) received in ample measure cloth 1 set and (gold ?) 1 *māṣa*, each in particular. || The three *patih*-s of Puluwatu: the
  9. *māmas* (*viz.*) *Si* Tirisan, father of Yoga, and the *tajyangin* (*viz.*) *Si* Kaṇḍi, father of Lucira, their *tunggūdurung* (*viz.*) *Si* Śaraṇa, father of Wawul; all (of them) received in ample measure cloth 1 set (and) gold 2 *māṣa*, each in particular. ||
  10. The *paruḥjar* of the *patih* of Kañcil (who is) the father of Waṇḍi received 1 piece of cloth (and) gold 1 *māṣa*. || The three *wahuta*-s of Puluwatu: the *airhajo*<sup>52</sup> (*viz.*) *Si* Dras, father of Waringin; his *tunggūdurung* (*viz.*) *Si* Baiśakha, father of Tumwa; the *wahuta* of the *winkas*
  11. of Wkas (or, the foremost *winkas*) (*viz.*) *Si* Katis; (all these) received in ample measure cloth 1 set (and)

50. The significance of the term is not quite clear.

51. Dr. Stutterheim (*op. cit.*) brings this place-name into connexion with Simapura of Nāg : 77 : 3 : 1-4.

52. The same as *airhaji*?



- gold 2 *māṣa*, each in particular. || The *wahuta* of Lampuran (*viz.*) *Si* Bhadra and his *pihujung-s*,<sup>52</sup> five persons, all received in ample measure one piece
12. of cloth (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular. || The *rāma māgēman-s* of the village that was marked out at Panggumulan, 6 persons<sup>53</sup> (: ) the *kalang manguwu* (*viz.*) *Si* Pingul, father of Udā ; the *gusti* (*viz.*) *Si*<sup>54</sup> Atag, father of Ranga ; the *winkas* (*viz.*) *Si* Wudal, father of Demoh ; the *tuha banua* (*viz.*) *Si* Guṇa, father of Dayang ; the *rāma matuha* (*viz.*) *Si* Wlang, father of Go ; the sculptor of the *watu sima* (i. e., the foundation-stone) (*viz.*) *Si* Śrū, father of Bukang, hailing from Dīhyang ;<sup>55</sup> (all of them) received in ample measure cloth 1 set (and)
14. gold 2 *māṣa*, each in particular. || Moreover, the *māgēman-s*, 7 persons, (and) the *kalang* (of the) *tung-gūdurung-s* (*viz.*) *Si* Tuḍe, father of Bhaiśākha ; the *hulu wras* (*viz.*) *ḍapunta* Bingung ; the *tuha wērēh* (*viz.*) *Si* Brit, *Si* Kpul, father of Mahār ; the two *wadahuma-s*<sup>56</sup> (namely ?) *Si* Plat, father of Dharmma and *Si* Uñja, father of Gamwoh ; *Si* Doho, father of Ramya ; *Si* Ranggēl, father of Tugan ; *Si* Kaladhara, father of Udāyaṇa ; *Si* Mangoh, father of Tarum ; all (of them) received in ample measure
16. cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular. || Little children, 18 persons : *Si* Bloṇḍo, *Si* Karan, *Si* Uyaṇa, *Si* Plat, *Si* Muga, *Si* Kuṇḍu, *Si* Glo, *Si* Alōng,<sup>57</sup> *Si* Bahu, *Si* Glar,

52. Their functions are not known.

53. In the following enumeration of six names, one comes from Dīhyang. He cannot, therefore, be a *rāma mageman* of Panggumulan. So, one name appears to be missed by the copyist.

54. The writer has employed the Skt. *sandhi*-rule here.

55. As Dīhyang or Diēng was the sacred place *par excellence*, there is no wonder that the sculptor belonged to that place.

56. Their functions are not known.      •

57. The writer has employed the Skt. *Sandhi*-rule here.

17. *Si Limbu*, *Si Tunggū*, *Si Tiḍu*, *Si Gwarī*, *Si Kawəl*,  
*Si Balubu*, *Si Bngal*, *Si Drawəng*; all (of them)  
 received in ample measure one piece of cloth (and)  
 gold 1 *kupang*, each in particular.|| The older matrons:  
*Si Turuk*, mother of *Ngga*;
18. *Si Taḍah*, mother<sup>58</sup> of *Bai*; *Si Rumpung*, mother of  
*Ḍaimoh*; (all) received in ample measure one piece of  
 skirt (and) *kampit* 1, each in particular. || Moreover,  
 mothers of young children, 15 persons: *Si Gawī*, mother  
 of *Kṛṣṇa*; *Si Magya*, mother of *Śryan*; *Si Kuḍuk*,  
 mother of.
- III. a. 1. *Rampūan*; *Si wrut*, mother of *Tugan*; *Si*  
*Kinang*, mother of *Barubuh*; *Si Dakī*, mother of  
*Mahṣar*; *Si Turukan*, mother of *Tarum*; *Si Haryya*,  
 mother of *Ramya*; *Si Balyah*, mother of *Gamwo*; *Si*  
*Puñjang*, mother of *Gamwais*, *Si Lamyat*, mother of  
*Banī*; *Si Ḍayang*, mother of *Dayana*;
2. *Si Dita*, mother of *Bireḍis*; *Si Kutil*, mother of *Go*;  
*Si Tugan*, mother of *Wdai*; in all, 15 persons received  
 in ample measure one piece of skirt, each in particular.||  
 The wives of the youngsters: *Si Mahyang*, *Si Tagəs*, *Si*  
 • *Rikha*, *Si Sojara*, *Si Widoh*,
3. *Si Rampwas*, *Si Kaḍya*, *Si Camma*; in all, 8 persons  
 received in ample measure silver 4 *māṣa*, each in  
 particular.|| Even so, those of the neighbouring  
 villages who went to be witnesses: the *patih* of *Hino*;  
 the *patih* of *Kulumpang* (namely ?) *Si Puñjang*,
4. father of *Śrī*; the two *patih*-s of *Tiru rāṇu*; the  
*patih*-s of *Paṇḍawutan* (*viz.*) *Si Pryangka*, father of  
*Kurutug* and *Si Parama*, father of *Wulkan*; all (of  
 them) received in ample measure cloth 1 set (and) gold  
 2 *māṣa*, each in particular.|| The *rāma*-s<sup>59</sup> of the neigh-  
 bouring places who went to be
5. witnesses: (the *rāma*) of *Suru* under *Ho* (*Hino* ?)  
 (and) his *kalang* (*viz.*) *Si Pagar*, grandfather of

58. I suppose *rāi* to be the abbreviated form of *raiṇa*.

59. *rangma*=*ra*(*ng*)*ma*, i.e., *rama*.

Mahū; his *parujar* (viz.) *Si* Tahil, father of Waris; (the *rāma*) of Tguhan under Linggang: the *gusti* (viz.) *Si* Sunglit, father of Ptěng; his *parujar* (viz.) *Si* Hali, father of Jaluk; (the *rāma*) of Purud under Parantungan:

6. the *paṇḍe kalang*<sup>60</sup> (viz.) *Si* Taji, father of Swāmi; his *parujar* (viz.) *Si* Junět; (the *rāma*) of Pāstamwir: the *kalang* (viz.) *Si* Guṇakāra, father of Jaluk; his *parujar* (viz.) *Si* Ungḍa, father of Kisik; (the *rāma*) of Kinawuhan under Hino: the *gusti* (viz.) *Si* Bandeng, grandfather of Ajī; his *parujar* (viz.)
7. *Si* Tuḍu; (the *rāma*) of Wangun amwěk under Pangu-ruhan: the *paṇḍe* of the *rāma matuha-s* (viz.) *Si* Pyul, father of Śuddhi; his *parujar* (viz.) *Si* Julung; (the *rāma*) of Munggu wuatan under Lanḍa tamwir: the *rāma matuha* (viz.) *Si* Waduā, father of Impěn;
8. all the neighbours who went to be witnesses: 9 (persons) in all (?)<sup>61</sup>; the *patih-s* of men, 9 persons; all (of them) received in ample measure cloth 1 set (and) gold 2 *māṣa*, each in particular.|| Their *parujar-s*, in all 6 persons, received in ample measure one piece of cloth
9. (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular.|| Necessaries for marking out the free-hold: (for) *sang hyang* Brahmā, cloth 1 set (and) gold 1 *māṣa*; (for) *sang hyang kumpang*, cloth 4 sets (and) gold 4 *māṣa*, axe 1, plane 1, mattock 1, curved chopper 1, grass-cutter 1,
10. crowbar 4, cleaver 1, tiny hoe 1, *gulum* 1, *kurumbhagi*-knife 1, nail-clipper 1, *dom* 1, *tahas* 1, *bsi* 1, lamp 1, cooking bowls 2, sack 1, unbolstered rice 1 *kadut*, *wsi ikat* 1, goat 1, (buffalo-) heads 11,
11. *kumol* 1, cooked rice 4 pots, offering dish 1, cloth with precious stones of different colours<sup>62</sup> 1, offerings 5,

60. This appears to be the same as *tuha kalang*.

61. I think *hos* to be a mis-reading for *hop*.

62. Van Naeissen (op. cit., p. 143 and f. n. 7) offers the alternative translation of: a throne set with precious stones (?). See also Kern, *VG.*, VII, p. 46.

unbolstered rice on one dish, 4 hens, 4 eggs and the five necessities for offering (*viz.*) flower, paint, lamp, frankincense (and) scent.|| After all have

12. eaten, they removed themselves, made toilette with paint and flower, and sat on the ground in a circle, with the face turning to *sang hyang kudur* and the sacred *sima watu kulumpang* (which was placed) under the tent in the middle of the (selected) ground. The manner of sitting (of the persons present is as follows):
13. *Sang pamagat* Pikatan, the *raka* of Wantila,<sup>63</sup> the *samagat* Manungkuli took position in the north and faced the south; *sang wahuta hyang* (s) of the *kudur* and all the *tuhan mamuat wuwus-es* took position in the west and faced the east;
14. *wahuta-s*, *patih-s* and *ramanta-s* and all the residents of neighbouring villages<sup>64</sup> took position in the south and faced the north.<sup>65</sup> (Now) *sang makudur* began to swear, curse and take oath: he separated the neck of the hen which was crushed
15. on the *susu kulumpang*, threw off the egg on the sacred *watu sima* and placed *sang hyang* Brahmā<sup>66</sup> by the *susu (kulumpang)*, (saying): "Just as the dead hen cannot return to life, just as the shell of the egg is broken into hundred parts, just as
16. *sang hyang* Brahmā always burns fuels on all sides and then steadily destroys and burns them down without leaving (?) ashes to be swept away (by the wind), similarly (may be destroyed) the unrighteous person who disturbs the village of Panggumulan that has

63. Dr. Bosch draws our attention to the fact that the founder of the free-hold occupies the central position in the north. See OV, 1925, p. 47.

64. Bosch has remarked that the same order has been maintained in the distribution of gifts.

65. On the arrangement of seats, see Bosch, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-48. A somewhat original arrangement of seats is described in an inscription of Balitung published by Dr. Van Naerssen in *Aanw. Kol. Inst.*, 1934, Bijl. A.

66. The Fire-god.

been marked out into a free-hold by the *raka* of Wantil and marked out

17. by the *kudur* and the subordinate staff of the *rakryan mapatih!*" Such were the curses of *sang makudur*. These were listened to by the Hon. *wahuta-s patih*-s and the *rāma*-s, all the residents of the village as also all the neighbours. They paid respects to the sacred *watu sima*
18. *kulumpang* and saluted (it) with devotion. Further, without disturbing such (things), all of them returned to their (lontar-) leaves to eat; all of them were fed with excellent rice, *tumpuk*, *asinasin*, dried meat of *kakap*-fish (and) dried meat of *kaḍiwas*-fish, heaps of them,
19. (as also) *layar-layar*<sup>67</sup>, cray-fish, *halahala*<sup>68</sup> (and) eggs. Even so, two buffaloes (and) one goat were cooked. (These) were fully prepared with spices and were sufficiently taken in and relished. *Kwēlan*<sup>69</sup> (and) *pininka*<sup>69</sup> were (also) cooked.
20. There were (also) cooked meat (?), vegetables and kneaded *tetis*<sup>70</sup>. Even so, wine was drunk: there were palm-wine and rum; there were the juice of *jāti*<sup>71</sup> and the sap of cocoa. Now there was dancing. The *mapadahi*, the *marēgang* (viz.) *Si Catu* (who is) the father of *Kriyā*, the *mabrēkuk*<sup>72</sup>
- III. b. 1. (viz.) *Si Warā* (who is) the father of *Goga*; (they) received one piece of cloth (and) gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular.|| The four *mūla pañjut*-s<sup>73</sup>: *Si Ma* (who is) the father of *Kutil*, *Si Mangol*, *Si Sāgara* (and)

67. A kind of aquatic animal?

68. Evidently a kind of food-stuff.

69. Evidently they are also some kind of food.

70. I do not know what this substance is.

71. A kind of tree.

72. A class of musicians.

73. Their functions are unknown.

*Si Mandon*, received gold 1 *māṣa*, each in particular.  
The *mūla wulě*<sup>74</sup> (*viz.*)

2. *Si Māri* received gold 1 *kupang*. *Si Paracan* (who is) a buffoon received silver 4 *māṣa*. (While) going to sell rice, the people of *Tunggalangan* were seen to pass by at that time, going towards the market of *Siṇḍingan*, 4 persons: *Si*
3. *Antyan*, *Si Rampal*, *Si Surat*, *Si*<sup>75</sup> *Aranī*; the *tulung tutu*<sup>76</sup> of *Tiru ranu*; the people of *Sarupsu*, 3 persons: *Si Biddhi*, *Si Kyaing*, *Si Goḍa*. (All of them) received silver 1 *kupang*, each in particular. The Hon. *patih-s*, *wahuta-s* and
4. *rāmanta-s*, matrons and all the residents of the village—men and women, old and young—ate, drank (and then) returned to (their) living places: nobody remained behind at that time to eat, drink (and) dance. All expressed the satisfaction of their mind. Now is
5. expressed (this) that henceforward is absolutely settled and confirmed the village of *Panggumulan* under *Puluwatu*, (as this) is marked out into a free-hold by *sang wahuta hyang (s)* (of the) *kudur* and all the *tuhan mamuat ujar-s*. The free-hold of the *rakryan* of *Wantil (viz.) Pu Pālaka*
6. and his wife (*viz.*) *dyah Prasāda* and his sons (*viz.*) *Pu Palaku*, *Pu Gowinda* (and) *Pu Wangi tamuy*, is a gift of love for the god and the goddess of *Kinawuhan* (and) is to be confirmed for the remotest future. If there is any unrighteous person
7. who disturbs the free-hold of *Panggumulan* under *Puluwatu*, and also he who destroys the *susu (kulumpang)* so long as the moon and the sun remain in the sky and illuminate the earth-ball, for this period such person may suffer (the penalties of)

74. His function is not known to me.

75. The writer<sup>9</sup> has employed the Skt. *Sandhi*-rule here.

76. A class of people or officers.

8. the five great sins. The *watu warani*, *dharmmasinta* and *halang manuk* wrote this edict (*praśasti*). ||O|| Hail ! The Śaka year expired, 825, the month of Bhādra, fourth day of the dark half of the month, *wurukung*,<sup>77</sup> *kaliwon*,<sup>78</sup>
9. Monday. At that time, the *rakryan* of Wantil, husband and wife (*viz.*) *Pu Pālaka* and (his) wife *dyah Prasāda* and their three sons (*viz.*) *Pu Palaku*, *Pu Gowinda* (and) *dyah Wangi tamuy*, purchased
10. the lands of the *rāmanta*-s of Panggumulan: these were mortgaged (to others?); the garden named *Siddhayoga*<sup>79</sup> and the *sawaḥ*-fields at Panilman were purchased for silver 3 *kati* from the *ḍapunta* Prabhu
11. and the *ḍapunta* Kaca.<sup>80</sup> This silver was received by the *tuha kalang* of Panggumulan (*viz.*) *Si Tuḍai* (who is) the father of *Be*, the *gusti* (*viz.*) *Si Blondo*, the *winkas* (*viz.*) *Si Wudəl* (who is) the father of
12. *Ḍaimoh*, the *rāma maratā* (s) (*viz.*) *Pu Dharmma*, *Pu Ramaṇī*, *Si Uñju*, *Si Tiḍu*, the *hulu wras* (*viz.*) *Si Ratnī*, the *jātata*<sup>81</sup> (*viz.*) *Si Sunī*. The witnesses thereof are the *marhyang* of *Dakṣiṇa*<sup>82</sup> (*viz.*) *ḍapunta Mūrṭti*, the *paṣingir*<sup>83</sup> (*viz.*) *Si Go* (who is) the father of *Kacū*, the *ḍapunta Tiwī*. (This is) written by *sang Karamwa*.

77. A Mal.-Polynesian day of the six-day week.

78. A Mal.-Polynesian day of the five-day week.

79. The temple of Siddhayoga where a god is worshipped is referred to in OJO LI dating from 866 Śaka.

80. Dr. Bosch, however, thinks that *Pu Pālaka*, his wife and three sons redeemed the mortgaged lands of the *rāma*-s of Panggumulan, whereby were given in mortgage the land named Siddhayoga and the *sawaḥ*-field at Panilman which latter one was purchased for silver 3 *kati*, etc.

81. This appears to be a mistake for *jātaka*.

82. Lit. The southern region. *Dakṣiṇa* may, however, be the name of a place.

83. This may mean 'neighbour'.

## MISCELLANY

### A New Drama of Aśvaghōṣa

By VIDHUSHEKHARA BHATTACHARYA

Lüders and other scholars have shown from the fragments of palm-leaf manuscripts discovered at Turfan, that Aśvaghōṣa is the author of a drama entitled *Śāriputraprakaraṇa* or *Śāradvatīputraprakaraṇa* which is in nine Acts. The same manuscripts give us the information also of two other dramas, one an allegorical one like Kṛṣṇamīśra's *Prabodhacandrodaya* and the other possibly a *prakaraṇa* like *Mṛcchakaṭikā*, in which figures a courtesan, Magadhavati. There is no positive evidence of their being written by Aśvaghōṣa, but as their fragments are found in the manuscript in which those of the Śāriputraprakaraṇa are contained it is probable that they are also of the same author.

Now it is clearly found in the *Vādanyāya* of Dharmakīrti (ed. Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, p. 63), that Aśvaghōṣa wrote a drama *Rāṣṭrapāla* or *Rāṣṭrapālanāṭaka*. Dharmakīrti writes :

nāsty ātmeti vyaṃ Bauddhā brūmaḥ/  
ke Bauddhāḥ/  
ye Buddhasya bhagavataḥ Śāsanam abhyupagatāḥ/  
ko Buddhō bhagavān/  
yasya śāsane bhadanta Aśvaghōṣaḥ pravrajitaḥ/  
kaḥ punar bhadanta Aśvaghōṣaḥ/  
yasya *Rāṣṭrapālaṃ* nāma nāṭakaṃ/

About the drama itself the text says :

kīdṛśam *Rāṣṭrapālaṃ* nāma nāṭakamiti/  
prasaṅgaṃ kṛtvā nāndyante tataḥ praviśati Sūtradhāraḥ/

There is nothing more of the drama. The last portion of the passage quoted immediately above indicates some peculiarity about the beginning of this drama.



Further information about this drama comes from a commentary, *Nyāyamañjarigranthibhaṅga* by one Cakra-dhara, son of Bhaṭṭasankara, on the *Nyāyamañjarī* of Jay-antabhaṭṭa (900 A. D.). It is written there that Aśvaghoṣa is the author of the *Rājyapālanātaka*<sup>1</sup>. It is to be noted that we have here *Rājyapāla*<sup>o</sup> and not *Rāṣṭrapāla*<sup>o</sup> as in *Vādanyāya*. But this difference is immaterial, and we have reasons to believe that the latter is the right reading. One will do well to examine the manuscript of the *Nyāyamañjarī-granthibhaṅga* in order to get some more light on the point.

We may think that the plot of the drama is taken from the *Raṭṭhapālasutta* in the *Majjhimanikāya* (82)<sup>2</sup>. It is quite fit to be dramatised. For easy reference the summary of the story as given by Winternitz in his *History of Indian Literature* (Eng. edition), Vol II, pp. 48-49, is given below with slight modification here and there.

The young prince Raṭṭhapāla desires to become a monk. His parents absolutely refuse to consent, but, by refusing to take any food, he compels them to give their permission. Years later, he returns as a monk to his native town, and begs at the door of his parents' home. His father does not recognise him, nor does he give him anything. "By these shaven monks," he cries, "our only dearly beloved son was induced to renounce the world." Meanwhile, a maid-servant comes out to throw away some scraps of food. The mendicant monk begs for these scraps for his meal. Then she recognises him as the son of the house and announces this to her master. The latter comes out and invites his son to enter the house. The latter politely declines, saying "Not so, I have already dined to-day." However, he accepts an invitation for the next day. His father prepares for him not only a meal, but heaps up gold and ornaments

1. See the Catalogue of MSS. in Jesalmere Bhandars, Gackwad's Oriental Series, No. XXI, p. 31.

2. See *Rāṣṭrapāla Avadāna* in the *Avadānaśataka* (90), and *Raṭṭhapāla Apadāna* in the *Apadāna*

in the dining-room, and instructs the former wives of Raṭṭhapāla to adorn themselves. The next day he is received splendidly, and his father offers him all the jewels and treasures. But Raṭṭhapāla says: "If you want to follow my advice, father, then load all the gold and ornaments on a cart and throw it into the Ganges where it is deepest. And why? Because nothing but pain and misery, wretchedness and sufferings will arise out of it." Neither will he have anything to do with the women, who throw themselves coaxingly at his feet. After he has finished his meal, he goes his way. Then he meets the King of the Kuru-land, who says that he can understand that a person who has become old or ill or poor or has lost his relatives becomes a monk, but he cannot understand why one who is young, happy and healthy should renounce the world. Raṭṭhapāla answers him in a speech on the vanity of existence and insatiableness of desire, and convinces the Kuru-King in a Socratic dialogue, of the truth of the doctrine of Buddha. Whether this is the subject-matter of the drama cannot be ascertained until the drama is discovered.

*Calcutta.*

## A note on the Indian prototypes of the Papar relief

By JITENDRA NATH BANERJEA

Attention was drawn by me to the proper identification of an image which was discovered in Papar, Kediri (East Java), in the last issue of the Journal of the Greater India Society (vol. IV, no. 2, p. 137ff.). I attempted to prove that the relief in question combined a few of the iconographic features of the three different varieties of the images of Gaurī (*Gauryādayah*) viz. Śrī, Pārvatī and Totalā as described in the *Rūpamaṇḍana*, an iconographic text probably compiled by a Mewar Sculptor in the 15th century A. D. I referred to certain South Indian and East Indian images, both stone and bronze, of dates ranging from the 8th to the 12th centuries A. D. in order to prove that the comparatively late iconographic texts like the one utilised by me were based on actual images of much earlier date. In the present note I wish to draw the attention of scholars to one of the side figures (*Pārśvadevatās*) in the fairly old temple of Mahādeva at Buchkalā in Jodhpur State, for demonstrating that more or less similar figures were also made in Rajputana. The early Śiva temple there, facing east, consists of a sanctum and a porch. D. R. Bhandarkar describes thus the *pārśvadevatās* of the temple: in its principal niches on the north and the south faces are Harihara and Gaṇapati respectively; in the back niche is a standing image of a goddess with four hands. Below on each side of her is a cup (?) with flames issuing out of it, and above on her right is a *liṅga* and on her left Gaṇapati. Unfortunately the writer of the above report does not furnish us with more details about the attributes held in the four hands of the female deity, nor does he mention the object on which the goddess is made to stand. But the few

details about her which are noticed by him disclose her identity. A firepot on her either side and the phallic emblem of Śiva on the top right and Gaṇapati on the top left of the *prabhāvalī* prove that she belongs to the Pārvati-variety of the Gaurī images. The difference between the Elura Pārvati (noticed in my previous article) and this image lies in that the former holds the Śivalinga and Gaṇapati in her two upper hands while the latter does not do so. In this respect the Buchkala image has some affinity with the many stone images of Pārvati-Gaurī of Eastern India also mentioned by me in my previous article. It is, however, interesting to observe in this connection that these types of Devī images which must have served as the prototypes of the Pāpar image were known not only in eastern and southern India, but also in northern India. The temple in which the image appears as a *pārśvadevatā* was most probably erected during the time of the imperial Pratihāras.

1. D. R. Bhandarkar, 'Progress Report of the Archaeological Survey of India,' *Western Circle*, 1907, p. 38.

*Calcutta.*

## Note on a Type of Lokesvara in Cambodge

By Dr. U. N. GHOSHAL

In the course of his luminous survey of the Lokeśvara cult in Indo-China<sup>1</sup> published some years back, the late lamented M. Finot had occasion to speak of the group of temples now called Nāḱ Pān lying on the northern outskirts of Angkor Thom. The researches of M. Finot and Goloubew<sup>2</sup> had previously demonstrated that the temple was a sanctuary of Lokeśvara erected in the middle of a tank representing the Anavatapta Lake. Among the antiquities recovered from this site were some fragments of sculpture which Finot in the paper above-mentioned took to represent two hands holding a bowl with the neck turned towards the bottom ("quelques fragments représentant deux mains portant un vase le goulot dirigé vers le bas")<sup>3</sup>. With these fragments Finot aptly compared a standing figure of Avalokiteśvara from Sarnath,<sup>4</sup> where the god has a *dhyānī* Buddha in *samādhi* posture placed above his head and holds with both hands a bowl in front of his breast. The only difference noticed by Finot<sup>5</sup> between the Indian and Indo-Chinese images was that while at Sarnath the bowl is held in its natural position, at Nāḱ Pān it is turned downwards and in case of figure *a* it actually represents the flow of the liquid.

1. *Lokeśvara en Indo-Chine*, in *Études Asiatiques*, tome I, pp. 227-256.

2. *Le symbolisme de Naḱ Pam*, BEFEO., XXIII., pp. 401-5, quoted *Ibid.*

3. *Études Asiatiques* I, p. 248 and Pl. 23, figs. *a* and *b*.

4. Noticed in *Ann. Rep. of the Arch. Survey of India*, 1904-5, p. 82 and Pl. XXIX *b*; also in *Cat. of Mus. of Archaeology at Sarnath* by Daya Ram Sahni, pp. 199-20 and Pl. XIV.

5. *Études Asiatiques* I, p. 249 *n*.

A careful scrutiny of the Nāḱ Pān fragments makes us hesitate to accept Finot's suggested identification. In figure b, it will be observed, the bowl has its lid closed which is rather an unusual pose for holding it downwards. Again in figure a, what is called the flow of the liquid looks more like the big stopper of a bottle. That the artists of Cambodia were not unacquainted with the natural representation of vases held downwards will appear from some reliefs on pediments of the smaller pavilions at Nāḱ Pān which are reproduced by Finot.<sup>6</sup> Here the vase held downwards is not only wanting in its lid, but the flow of the liquid is shown by long vertical lines. We have therefore to look elsewhere for explanation of these mysterious fragments.

If we turn M. Finot's photograph upside down, we at once find it to represent a bowl held upright with both hands joined in a kind of *añjali* pose. It thus very closely approaches the Sarnath Avalokiteśvara image where similarly both the hands of the god are shown as holding the bowl in *añjali mudrā*.

Have we any clue for discovering the form of Avalokiteśvara represented in these images? In Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharya's description of the 108 forms of Avalokiteśvara known to the Macchandar Vihār at Kathmandu, the varieties of Lokeśvara holding the bowl or water-pot in both hands are Vaśyādhikāra Lokeśvara (Pl. XLIV, No. 8), Nilakaṇṭha Lokeśvara (Pl. XLVII, No. 17), Piṇḍapātra Lokeśvara (Pl. LXI, No. 73), and Dharmadhātu Lokeśvara (Pl. LXV, No. 90). Unfortunately all these forms are shown as holding the bowl in the *samādhi* pose. Nevertheless Dr. Bhattacharya has tentatively identified<sup>7</sup> the Sarnath image with Nilakaṇṭha Lokeśvara. In favour of this identification it may be pointed out that the bowl held by the god in the Sarnath figure looks more like a vessel full of

6. *loc. cit.*, Pl. VII.

7. *op. cit.*, p<sup>o</sup> 49 and Pl. XXIII e

gems that a water-pot, while in the *Sādhana* texts quoted by the same scholar, Nilakaṇṭha is the only form of Lokeśvara holding a bowl of gems in both hands<sup>8</sup>. In the Nāik Pān fragments still more than in the Sarnath image, the bowl looks like a vessel for containing gems. We may thus tentatively identify them as belonging to the same group of Nilakaṇṭha Lokeśvara as the Sarnath image. It must, however, be admitted that the other attributes of the deity, such as the sacred thread made of deer-skin, the absence of ornaments, the two cobras on either side, are completely wanting in the Sarnath image.

8. Cf. the epithet *nānāratnaparipūrṇakapāladhāriṇam* in the *sādhana* of Nilakaṇṭha Lokeśvara, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

## Kaṭāhanagara in the Kaumudimahotsava

By DR. DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

In a paper contributed to the *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*, Rajahmundry, I have suggested that the celebrated Sanskrit drama *Kaumudimahotsava* (J.A.H.R.S., II-III, Appendix) is not earlier than the 7th or 8th century A. D. In this connection it is interesting to note that the drama mentions (p. 37) Kaṭāhanagara as a familiar and famous place, together with Kāñci and other well-known Indian cities. This Kaṭāhanagara appears to be no other than the celebrated city of Kaṭāha, identified with Keddah in the Malay Peninsula. Kaṭāha became famous in the eastern world with the ascendancy of the imperial dynasty of the Śailendras about the 8th century A.D. The Śailendra Emperors are known to have had political relations with the Pālas of eastern India in the ninth century and with the Coḷas of southern India in the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D.<sup>1</sup> This possibly explains why Kaṭāha figures prominently in Medieval Indian works like the *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*.<sup>2</sup>

It may however be pointed out that the Vāmana<sup>3</sup> and Garuḍa<sup>4</sup> Purāṇas mention Kaṭāha in the list of the nine divisions of Bhārata-varṣa in place of Saumya or Gāndharva mentioned in other Purāṇas, like the Mārkaṇḍeya,<sup>5</sup> Viṣṇu,<sup>6</sup> Vāyu,<sup>7</sup> Brahmanḍa,<sup>8</sup> etc. But it is interesting to note that

1. R. C. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, pp. 152ff; 167ff.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 51; *Kathā-sarit-sāgara*, Taraṅga 13, verse 70ff; Taraṅga 56, verse 54ff; Taraṅga 61, verse 3; Taraṅga 123, verses 150ff; 110.

3. XIII, 10-11.

4. Pūrva-khaṇḍa, 55,4-5.

5. 57, 6.

6. Part II, 3, 6.

7. 45, 79.

8. 49, 13. The Purāṇic texts consulted are those published by the Baṅgabāsī Office, Calcutta,



Ptolemy ( middle of the 2nd century A. D. ), who gives a fairly detailed account of Malayasia,<sup>9</sup> does not mention any name like Kaṭāha.<sup>10</sup> It is therefore not impossible that the references to Kaṭāha in the Vāmana and Garuḍa Purāṇas are later interpolations. They do not appear to be earlier than the period when Kaṭāha became famous under the Śailendra emperors. The *Kaumudīmahotsava* seems also to be a work of the same age.<sup>11</sup>

9. Geography, VII, ii.

10. Alberūnī's *India* (translated by Sachau, p. 296 of Part I) does not recognise the reading *Kaṭāha* in place of *Saumya* or *Gāndharva*.

11. The evidence of "an old Tamil poem" (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, p. 170) which refers to Kāḷagam (identified by a later commentator with Kaḍāram, i.e. Kaṭāha) is not beyond doubt.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

**The Khārīās**, by Sarat Chandra Roy, M. A. and Ramesh Chandra Roy, M. Sc. with a Foreword by Dr. R. R. Marett, M. A., D. Sc., Ll. D., F. B. A. Vol. I (?). Pp. xiv + 1 to 306 ; Vol. II. Pp. 307 to 530 + xlvii (?) (perhaps lvi). Published by the authors from "Man in India" Office, Ranchi.

Anthropologists are indebted to Rai Bahadur Sarat Chandra Roy and Mr. Ramesh Chandra Roy for a thorough, reliable and minute account of the Khārīās of Chota Nagpur and the adjacent tracts. Rai Bahadur Sarat Chandra Roy is well known among anthropologists for his accounts of the Muṇḍās, Orāons, Birhors, and Bhūiyās. He has lifted the veil of mystery which shrouded the jungle tribes of Ranchi plateau and has made us thoroughly acquainted with these tribes through his pen-pictures. The volume under discussion is the product of twelve years of field-work on the part of Mr. S. C. Roy and the joint-author collaborated in the latter part of this work. During 1930-1932 the joint-author worked on the Khārīās under the direction of the late Dr. P. Mitra, M. A., Ph. D. of the University of Calcutta and he submitted a thesis on this tribe, which was duly approved in lieu of two papers for the M. Sc. Examination of the University in Anthropology in 1932.

The book consists of sixteen chapters and four appendices and an index. The sixteen chapters deal with the habitat and population, the origin and migrations, previous accounts of the tribe, their physical anthropology, material culture, social organization, tribal government, birth, childhood, and puberty rites, marriage, pregnancy and divorce, death and its attendant ceremonies, religious beliefs, deities and spirits, religious feasts and festivals, magic and witchcraft, folklore, myths, amusements and games, art, dances and songs and a general view of Khārīā

life and manners which forms the conclusion. In the four appendices we find records of physical measurements and their averages, local distribution of clans and an account of the source of Hill Khārīās origin-myth.

The Khārīās are scattered over a part of the 'Central Belt' of India between 20° and 23° North Latitude and 79° and 87° East Longitude. "In the extreme east of this belt dwell the Erengā or Hill Khārīās, in the middle the Dūdh Khārīās, and in the west the Delki or D̐helki Khārīās with a sprinkling of Dūdh Khārīās." Quite a large number of the tribe has migrated to Assam and Jalpaiguri in recent years. According to the authors the "Hill Khārīās have their stronghold in the Simlipal range of the Mayurbhanj State." The Dūdh Khārīās are massed together on both banks of the Sankh and South Koel in Gumla and Simdega subdivisions of the Ranchi District and extend into the Gangpur State of Orissa while the D̐helki Khārīās predominate in the Jashpur State of the Central Provinces and the adjacent Talsera Thana of the Gangpur State.

The Khārīās are not free from contact with other aboriginal tribes and Hindu or Hinduised castes. Even the Hill Khārīās, who are by nature shy and conservative, have not escaped the influence of their Hindu neighbours. The settled Dūdh and D̐helki Khārīās also live in close association with Hindu castes and aboriginal tribes and show their influence in social customs, religious ideas and language. Christianity has made considerable progress among this tribe and out of 146,037 Khārīās of Chota Nagpur and Orissa, 63,725 have adopted Christianity. The authors are of opinion that economic troubles coupled with persecution of Hindu landlords and money-lenders have driven the Khārīās to the Christian fold. While on this point the authors observe that though the Christian Missions have "given an impetus to the intellectual and industrial progress of the people through the spread of education", they have at the same time "introduced a certain amount of complexity and artificiality in the Khārīā converts' life and

tended to destroy the old tribal solidarity and to impair the old exuberance of spirits and enjoyment of life among their youth."

In the section on "linguistic and racial affinities" the authors have only summarised the views of Sir George Grierson and have stated that the Khārīā language is spoken by all the Khārīās of Ranchi District, Gangpur and Jashpur States and by some Khārīās of Udaipur, Raigarh, Sarangarh and Bilaspur. In other parts of Khārīā area, e.g., Mayurbhanj, Bengal, Surguja, the remaining tributary States of Orissa, etc. they speak the tongue of their more influential neighbours.

Depending on the traditions of the Dūdh and Ḍhelki sections our authors derive the Khārīās from the Kaimur Plateau. They identify Ruidās-Paṭnā of their traditions with Rohtasgarh or Rohtas Plateau of this range. The first wave of Khārīā migration consisted of the Hill Khārīās who established themselves in the hills of Mayurbhanj State. They were followed by the Ḍhelkis who at first occupied the banks of the Sankh in Ranchi whence they were dislodged by the Dūdh section which came last. The Hill Khārīās too have a tradition pointing to autochthonous origin in Mayurbhanj but our authors have summarily rejected it. *Apropos* of traditions, in the first paragraph of page 39 of the book the authors say that "Russel (*sic*) traces the descent of the Khārīās from the elder of two brothers of whom the younger by reason of his superior intelligence and taste was made king and became the ancestor of the Nāg Vaṃṣī Rajas of Chota Nagpur....." In the next paragraph of the same page we find the following statement: "Mr. Russel (*sic*) further says that the theory that the Khārīās stand in the relationship of younger brothers to the Muṇḍas derives some support from the fact that, according to Sir Herbert Risley<sup>31</sup>, the Muṇḍas will take daughters in marriage from the Khārīās but will not give daughters to them, and the Khārīās speak of the Muṇḍas as their elder brothers." The fact is that Mr. Russell has all along stated

that the Khāriās stand as elder brothers to the Muṇḍas and has cited as a parallel case the relationship which traditionally persists between the Parjas and the Rajas of Bastar or rather between the Parjas and the Raj-Gonds. (*Vide* Russell and Hiralal: *Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces*, Vol. III, pp. 445-446 & Vol. IV, pp. 372-373). Moreover, Mr. Russell has not tried to prove that the Khāriās are the younger brothers of the Muṇḍas from the fact that "the Muṇḍas will take daughters in marriage from the Khāriās but will not give daughters to them." Such marriage customs rather prove the contrary and Mr. Russell has utilised this fact exactly for that purpose.

The authors measured 270 Khāriās (Dūdh Khāriās—100, Dhelki Khāriās—100, and Hill Khāriās—70) between the ages 30 and 45. They took 12 measurements and made four observations on each individual. The individual measurements and observations are recorded in Appendix I. Tables, I, II and III. From these measurements they conclude that "the Khāriās are on the average, a dolichocephalic, hypsicephalic (orthocephalic with a tendency to be hypsicephalic), Platyrrhine and Chamaeprosopic (with a tendency to be Mesoprosopic) people." They have medium stature, 'brown to lightblack' skin colour, 'plentiful black or dark-brown (among the Hill section mostly due to non-use of oil and exposure to the sun) hair on the head', 'often slightly or even moderately retreating forehead', very depressed nasal root and often concave nasal bridge. They have small eyelids which are either straight or oblique inwards and have a "tendency to form the epicanthic fold" in a very few cases. The face is often oval, 'the malars moderately developed and the zygomatic arches prominent' in the majority. Alveolar prognathism is not uncommon (more among the females).

The authors' remarks on skin colour, hair, eye, malars, zygomatic arches, facial prognathism, and thickness of lips seem to be made from impressions and not based on any systematic record kept in the field. Their findings on the

nature of the forehead, supraorbital ridges, eversion of lips and the contour of the face are not always brought out by the facts recorded by them in Appendix I, Tables I, II and III. Thus in describing the forehead it is written that "The forehead is often slightly or even moderately retreating ..... but a complete vertical forehead is rarely seen". An analysis of the observations made by the authors and recorded in Appendix I shows that the "straight" forehead has got the highest percentage (45'18 p.c.), the slightly retreating occupies the next place (44'07 p.c.) and the retreating comes last (4'81 p.c.). It is not clear what they mean by "moderately retreating" as this class is not mentioned at the time of classification of data (*Vide* Vol. II, p. I. App.). As regards eversion of lips the writers note that "though not always everted, they have in some cases a tendency to be everted." The 'tendency to be everted' is not found only in *some cases* but in the majority of cases, as is evident from their own data. Thus among the 270 subjects examined about 58'14 per cent have got the 'tendency to be everted', 38'8 p.c. are 'not everted' and 2'96 are 'everted'.

The authors have classified the browridges into 'prominent' 'slightly prominent' and 'not prominent' groups in Appendix I. But while describing on page 60 they write that they are 'moderately developed in the majority'. We do not find any group called 'moderately developed' in the classification of the data, but if the authors mean by it the 'slightly prominent' group, then of course it has the majority. But it is difficult to accept this identification as the authors themselves differentiate between 'slightly' and 'moderately' at the beginning of the very same paragraph. It is always safe and convenient to use the same terms in classification as well as description of such data. The different types of browridges occur in the following proportion—'prominent'—about 4 p. c., 'slightly prominent'—about 51 p.c. and 'not prominent'—about 46 p. c.

The authors' description of the face leaves the readers

in doubt about the proportion of square and pentagonal faces and the relation between square and oval faces. If they had analysed their own data, they would have found the following proportions:—oval face—65'18 p.c., square face—29'25 p.c., and pentagonal face—5'5 p. c. Thus the authors' remark that "Pentagonal faces are not uncommon" cannot stand. They are rather rare while the square face is 'not uncommon.'

In the analysis of physical measurements the authors have adopted Haddon's classification in all except one, *viz.*, morphological facial index. The scales of differentiation as adopted from Haddon are not always accurate, e.g., orthocephalic heads range between 58 and —63 and not 64 as adopted by the authors. Moreover, the dash mark (—) used by the authors uniformly in Haddon's and Martin's scales have different meanings and this should have been noted at the beginning in order to avoid confusion of the 'lay readers.'

The Khārīās are spoken of as "hypsicephalic (orthocephalic with a tendency to be hypsicephalic)" The meaning of the bracketted portion is not clear. From the following percentages, *viz.*, hypsicephalic—48'51 p. c., orthocephalic—44'85 p. c. and platycephalic 7'4 p. c., it would appear that the orthocephaly of the Khārīās has a tendency towards hypsicephaly.

In describing the physical affinities among the three sections of the Khārīās the authors place the Dhelkis midway between the Hill and Dūdh sections. They have not tried to discuss the physical relations of the Khārīās with the other tribes of the locality. One of the reasons for which the authors did not compare their data with those of previous workers is 'difference due to personal errors.' This seems to be a novel ground for avoiding comparison. Personal error may vitiate the results when it is beyond a certain limit. All published data are generally accepted by scientists as within this limit and not beyond it. Of course, it would be more strictly scientific if the workers mention

their 'personal error' at the very beginning but this has not been practised by anybody in this branch of science. Up to date Risley has been criticised for various reasons but no one has refused to compare his data for 'personal errors.'

The chapter of physical anthropology of the Khārīās has been illustrated with a number of photographic reproductions showing the face and profile of individuals of both sexes from the three sections of the tribe. The authors have not tried to utilise these illustrations for showing the characteristic features of the different Khārīā types. There is a serious slip in this connection, Fig. 19, illustrating a Dūdh Khārīā type (to face page 20) appeared in *The Birhors* of Rai Bahadur Sarat Chandra Roy as a "Type of a Birhor adult of Samdhoar clan" (Vide *The Birhors*, Plate XI, facing page 59).

The profusely illustrated chapter on material culture of the Khārīās is a welcome feature of the book. It describes the annual and daily round of activities of all the three sections of the tribe, their villages and houses, their food and drink, household furniture and domestic utensils, weapons and implements, musical instruments, field products and industrial activities. But this excellent chapter has been marred by a considerable amount of carelessness and misuse of proper technical terms. Only a few of these are noted below :—

- (1) The numbers referring to plates or figures in the body of this chapter are, in most cases, not found on the plates or figures themselves.
- (2) Page 74, line, 7. "They" here indicate both men and women. Do the Khārīā women generally use bow and arrow? If so, it should have been especially noted. Or is it a slip of the pen?
- (3) Page 76, Lines, 6-7,. "Gets rice for the day's use threshed and husked." Paddy is stored after threshing as described on page 111. Then, how is it again threshed daily before husking.



- (4) Page, 91, lines 4-7,. The string-bed is said to be made by a "net-work" of strings of *sabai* grass. It is not "net-work" but mere woven-work. Nets have always knots at regular intervals to form the meshes. Even the figure of the string-bed in Plate V (Fig. 15) shows absence of knots. It is difficult to understand what the authors mean by "The netting is twisted work" (page 91, lines 6-7). Do they mean the twisted strand?
- (5) Page 94. The Dhaki (a kind of big basket for carrying and measuring grains and for bringing fuel) is made of "fine rounded bamboo strips about *one inch in diameter.*" (Italics are ours). We have never seen a carrying basket made with bamboo strips one inch in diameter. Are the strips pliable when so thick? What will be the approximate weight of such a carrying basket?
- Page 95. The Daurā (another kind of basket) is made of very thin bamboo strips each about "*one inch in diameter*" (Italics are ours). It is not clear how a *very thin* strip can have a diameter of one inch. Generally we mention the diameter of an object when its transverse section is circular. The authors perhaps here mean by *diameter* the *breadth* of the elements.
- Page 101. In describing the common arrow the authors say that the shaft is "made of bamboo of a diameter of two inches and a length of about one and a half feet." Illustration of the arrow is given in Plate VII, Fig. 18. We have never seen an arrowshaft with a diameter of two inches. It is further mentioned that "the fore-end of the shaft is often decorated with two or three birds' feathers." It is not the fore-end of the shaft where the feathers are placed but rather the end opposite to it which may be called the aft-end (see illustration given in Plate VII, Fig. 18.). Moreover, the birds'

feathers are not mere decorations but are primarily meant for keeping the arrow straight in course of its flight.

- (6) Page 108. The blade of the Khanta (digging implement) as described by the authors cannot have two pointed edges but rather two pointed ends. It is said to be "conical in shape and has four sides, each about four inches in length" and "is about one inch in diameter at the middle." A cone cannot have four sides nor a four-sided figure a diameter.
- (7) Page 109. The two varieties of the so-called harrow described by the authors and illustrated on Plate IX have no tooth. Harrows are always toothed. The implements described are perhaps mere levellers.

The Dūdh and the Dhelki sections of the Khāriās are divided into totemic exogamous patrilineal clans. The Dhelkis had eight original clans most of which have now more than one subdivision. Of the Dūdh Khāriā clans nine are original and the rest offshoots of these. The authors note the existence of rank among the original clans of both the sections with right to preside over tribal councils associated with particular clans of the superior rank. Some of these clans have also the right to be served first in social feasts. In Assam also we find this trait among some of the Kuki tribes. Unfortunately, the authors do not say anything about the relation between the subdivisions of an original clan in either section of the tribe.

Among the Hill Khāriās clan organization is found in Manbhum and Singbhum. In Mayurbhanj it is completely absent in certain villages while in others a debased form of it is found (page 122). In the latter class of villages the authors were told by different groups of informants from different villages that they had one, two or six *gotras* of totemic nature which were not exogamous. The authors do not seem to have verified these assertions with the help of genealogical tables. Mere assertions of informants on

such controversial topics are of no value unless they are corroborated from other sources. In fact, the absence of even a single genealogical table in a book of such magnitude is rather unfortunate. Genealogical method of investigation has been accepted all over the anthropological world as one of the best means of collecting data.

According to the authors, among the Dūdh and Dhelki sections of the Khārīās, "exogamous kinship group of the patrilineal clan is the basis of the social organization" (page 146). The patrilineal clan is not a kinship group. Dr. Rivers set at rest the vague and indefinite connotations of the terms *kin* and *kinship* in his *Social Organization* (Rivers, *Social Organization*, 1932, pp. 51-55) where he defines kinship "as relationship which is determined, and can be described, by means of genealogies." "According to this definition, kinship differs from relationship or sibship set up by membership of the moiety of clan, it being both wider and narrower in its scope, according to the point of view."

All the three sections of the Khārīās have mainly the classificatory type of relationship.

In all the three sections, each village has a headman and a council of all the adult male members of the village. It is their duty to look after the social and religious welfare of the village. The headman of a Khārīā village is also its sacrificer or priest. A higher form of political organization is found in the Parha Federation present in all the three sections of the tribe. This is primarily charged with the duty of maintaining tribal solidarity.

The religion of the Khārīās is characterised by a belief in and worship of the ancestor-spirits, the spirits of the hills and jungles and the Supreme Deity who is also the creator of the universe and ruler of men and other spirits. The Supreme Deity is often identified with the Sun. Offerings and sacrifices are made to these deities and spirits and prayers are also addressed to them. The officiant is sometimes the hereditary village priest and sometimes the

housefather. Magic also occupies an important position in their lives.

It has been claimed that the "three sections of the tribe represent three successive levels of primitive culture" (Vol. I, Preface, p. III)—the Hill Khārīās occupy the lowest, the D̥helki the middle, and the Dūdh section the highest rung of the ladder. To us it appears that there is practically no difference of cultural level between the D̥helki and Dūdh sections in the essentials of culture. They have the same type of material, social and religious traits. The differences that are visible are only in minor details and are not sufficient to place them on different culture-levels. On the other hand, the position of the Hill Khārīās raises doubts in our mind. At present they mainly pursue food-gathering activities though migratory hill cultivation (page 73) and even plough cultivation (page 107) are sometimes found in certain areas. If the last two traits are proved to be borrowed from their more advanced neighbours then they may be safely spoken of as belonging to a lower level of material culture. But if their sporadic occurrence be due to degeneration brought about by environment we cannot agree with the conclusions of the authors. Moreover, in social and religious traits the Hill Khārīās do not differ much from the other two sections, at least not in the essential points. The authors seem to have been unduly carried away by their idea of three successive stages. A more careful and sifting enquiry is necessary before we can pronounce any judgment on this point.

In spite of what we have said above, we congratulate the authors for the wealth of detail which characterises this important contribution to Indian ethnography and we extend our welcome to this and such other studies on the tribal cultures of India.

T. C. D.

**Die Indogermanen und Germanenfrage:**—Neue wege zu ihrer Lösung. Wiener Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte und Linguistik, Jahrgang IV (1936). Publication of the *Institut für Volkerkunde an der Universität Wien*. Edited by Wilhelm Koppers. Verlag Anton Pustet, Salzburg—Leipzig ; pp. 787.

The Ethnological Institute of Vienna University has already done much useful work in the fields of linguistics, prehistoric archaeology, and ethnology, which ought to be better known in our country than they are at present. Under the able guidance of the renowned ethnologist Dr. Wilhelm Koppers, it published in the first volume (1930) of its *Beiträge* some excellent articles of great importance not only for ethnology but also for general linguistics. The second volume was devoted exclusively to ethnology *Beiträge zur Methodik der Volkerkunde* by Gaston Van Bulck), and the third consisted of two contributions on Sumatra by Edwin M. Loeb (*History and People*) and Robert Heine-Geldern (*Archaeology and Art*). Now the same Institute has presented us with the fourth volume of its *Beiträge*—a magnificent collection of essays by A. Nehring (*Studien zur indogermanischen Kultur und Urheimat*, pp. 7-230), W. von Brandenstein (*Die Lebensformen der Indogermanen*, pp. 231-278), W. Koppers (*Pferdeopfer und Pferdekult der Indogermanen*, pp. 279-412), R. Bleichsteiner (*Rossweihe und Pferderennen im Totenkult der Kaukasischen Völker*, pp. 413-496), W. Amschler (*Die ältesten Funde des Hauspferdes*, pp. 479-516), V. G. Childe (*The Antiquity of Nordic Culture*, pp. 517-530), R. Pittioni (*Die Uraltertumskunde zur Frage der indogermanischen Urheimat*, pp. 531-548), A. Closs (*Die Religion des Semnonenstammes*, pp. 549-674), and Alexander Slawik (*Kultische Geheimbünde der Japaner und Germanen*, pp. 675-764). Every one of these writers has tried to solve here the problem of the original home of the Indo-Europeans in his own way, and in this respect it may be safely called the most important publication in the field of Indo-European philology after the *Hirt-Festschrift*,

though, as their titles suggest most of the articles in the present volume are concerned more with ethnology and prehistoric archaeology than with linguistics proper. In the *Hirt-Festschrift*, the ethnologists had made a valiant effort to solve this problem which has engaged the attention of linguists of every generation, most of the articles on the subject there being distinctly characterised by a warm sympathy for the theory of Kossinna to whom German and Indo-European were synonymous terms. The present volume marks the inevitable reaction against this tendency, and the old hypothesis of the South Russian home of the original Indo-Europeans has been re-asserted here by a past master in the subject—A. Nehring—in the light of the latest linguistic researches, supported in his conclusions by eminent ethnologists like Koppers and Amschler, and prehistoric archaeologists like Pittioni and Gordon Childe.

Already the editor of *Hirt-Festschrift* deplored that Indo-European philology has lost its separate entity and homogeneity, for comparativists are no longer content with comparisons only within this close body of languages. The truth of this statement will be evident to everybody who looks into Nehring's opening article in which the very basic words of Indo-European vocabulary, such as \**g<sup>w</sup>* *ūs*, \**eq<sup>w</sup>* *uos*, etc., are treated as loan-words, and I. E. bases are connected with all the language groups from African Bantu to Chinese, including Semitic, Ugro-Finnic, Altaic and Caucasian languages. The impression is irresistible that the primitive I. E. vocabulary perhaps consisted solely of loan-words, and that, like the I. E. race, the basic I. E. language too is nothing but an imaginary construction! This is mystifying indeed, but Nehring has driven home his points with such inexorable thoroughness that he would be a bold man indeed who would dare to differ from him. Another distinguishing feature of Nehring's work is that Comparative Philology has been brought in it into close contact and collaboration with botany, zoology, prehistoric archaeology and anthropology, though he has not indulged

in ethnological speculation,—a wise omission, which his collaborators however have tried to make good. Nowhere has Nehring arbitrarily declared particular features of I. E. culture to be “arctic” or “southern” after the fashion of these ethnologists. Nehring leaves open the question of Altaic influence on I. E. culture—the favourite thesis of Koppers—but admits that inner Asiatic elements are quite unmistakable in it from a linguistic point of view which might be partially due to Altaic influence. But much more important in this respect is the particularly close relation between Ugro-Finnic and Indo-European. This proves that the original home of the Indo-Europeans must be assigned somewhere in the proximity of the Uralic region. Considering everything, it must have been situated to the south of the Ugro-Finnic original home in middle Russia between the Urals and the Caspian Sea and just to the north of the cultural sphere of the Caucasian languages. This is quite definite and easily explains also the unmistakable Semitic and Caucasian influences on the original I.E. culture. But as on the showing of Bleichsteiner the Caucasian culture had once spread even to the Pamirs, the I. E. original home might have extended somewhat farther to the east and part of it might have been actually included in geographical Asia. But Nehring is sceptical about this further extension. He then draws upon prehistoric archaeology to further elucidate the problem and declares the Ukranian Tripolje-culture to be the culture of the earliest Indo-Europeans. As for the absolute dating of the same, he points out that there can be no doubt to-day that elements of I. E. culture can be traced already in Troy I (c. 3000 B. C.), so that the peak-point of the original I. E. civilisation before the dissolution of the tribes began must have been reached at the end of the fourth millennium B.C. at the latest. Regarding the various types of ceramic art in prehistoric Europe and their connection with early I. E. culture, Nehring shows a non-committal attitude: however unfavourable might be the picture to the identification of

the Schnurkeramik with the earliest I E. culture, it is all the more favourable to the connection with the Tripolje-culture (p. 61). These conclusions are further strengthened by a detailed and searching examination of all that is known about I. E. cattle-breeding, agriculture, use of metals, house-building, organisation of family, clan and state, religion, etc. The last word of Comparative Philology on all these points is to be found here. In anthropological questions Nehring depends mainly on Eikstedt who also favours the theory of a south Russian home for the primitive Indo-Europeans.

Brandenstein in his article on the forms of life of the primitive Indo-Europeans has shown that much can be achieved in the field of Comparative Philology by what may be called applied semasiology. His method is to trace the changes of meaning undergone by the basic stems in the various dialects, and to determine in this way the meaning which attached to them originally, always keeping in mind that meanings too are evolved in a definite chronological order. Thus "cattle" at one stage could and did signify "money", but at no stage can "money" signify "cattle". As this example shows, the guiding principle of the author is surely sound and will undoubtedly produce more positive results in future. But his method is weak. He depends on Walde-Pokorny not only for the bases but also for their meanings.

In his ethnological study on the horse-sacrifice and horse-cult of the Indo-Europeans, Koppers gives a detailed analysis of the horse-sacrifice among ancient Indians, Iranians, Slavs, Greeks, Romans, Celts and Germans, and draws conclusions, mostly unwarranted in the opinion of the present reviewer, which go to support the South-Russian hypothesis of Nehring. Amschler's is a Zoological study in which he has tried to ascertain the oldest finds of tame horses. He concludes that the horse played a very minor rôle in the Tripolje-culture, and that the oldest finds in northern Europe point to a period about 2200 B.C. The



conclusion reached in Childe's closely written article on the antiquity of Nordic culture goes definitely against those who would make of Germany the original home of the Indo-Europeans "the Nordic neolithic culture began late as compared with the British and Danubian and only when the neolithic economy had been left behind in the East Mediterranean and Hither Asia. The Nordic province, which was still absorbing cultural impulses from its neighbours, would then hardly seem a promising Urheimat for the Indogermanen" (p. 529).—Essentially the same view is also expressed by Pittioni, who declares: "The problem of the I. E. original home takes such a form that neither the Nordic culture may be called the I. E. Ur-culture nor its home may be declared the original I. E. home, but the eastern region characterised by Kammkeramik. The north gave only the finishing touch to the human waves coming from the east" (p. 544). Alois Closs in his learned article discusses various details of the religions of the ancient Germanic tribes,—much in the fashion of Guntert in his "*Der arische Weltkönig*".—In the concluding article Alexander Slawik draws attention to various points of similarity between Germanic and Japanese cult and religion. It is not clear however, what conclusion the author wishes to draw from these apparent similarities.

Altogether it is a volume rich in materials and suggestions. It is indispensable to every philologist on account of Nehring's magnificent dissertation. And I hope that the other articles too will prove to be useful to all who are interested in ethnology.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH

## **Extracts from the Annual Report of the Greater India Society for the year 1936-37**

### **GENERAL**

With the year 1936-37 the Greater India Society entered upon the tenth year of its existence. The Society's record during the year was, on the whole, one of steady progress.

### **MANAGEMENT**

The constitution of the Managing Committee remained unchanged during the year. The Joint-Secretary, Dr. Kalidas Nag, however, was called away from the scene of his labours to join the Congress of World-writers held at Buenos Aires in September 1936, as also the staff of the Honolulu University as the first Indian visiting Professor for a period of six months (January-July 1937). As in former years the important business of the Committee was disposed of as the occasion arose by circulation among the members. During the year the Honorary Secretary continued to act as the Honorary Editor of the Society's *Journal*, in accordance with the resolution of the Committee to that effect. The Journal Committee remained the same as at the beginning of the year.

### **OFFICE**

The office-establishment was maintained on the economic level of the previous years. Mr. P. K. Sen, Chartered Accountant, again deserved the thanks of the Committee by acting as Honorary Auditor of the Society's accounts for the second year in succession.

## MEMBERS & SUBSCRIBERS

The number of members on the Society's roll on the 31st March 1937 remained the same as in the corresponding period of the previous year. The number of subscribers to the Society's *Journal* remained almost at the same level. The Committee takes this opportunity to convey its heartfelt thanks to the Governments of Baroda, Mysore, Travancore and Gwalior and the Archaeological Survey of India with its different provincial circles as well as various Provincial Governments and the authorities of several Indian universities and colleges for the continued patronage extended to the Society's *Journal*. No fresh Honorary Member of the Society was elected in place of the late-lamented Dr. E. Obermiller whose loss was mourned by the Committee last year.

## FINANCE

The closing balance of the Society's accounts on the 31 March 1937 was Rs. 844-0-8 as compared with Rs. 656-13-5 which was the figure for the previous year and Rs. 478-5-3 the figure for the year immediately preceding. This favourable state of the finances is partly due to an accident, as Dr. Tucci's work, *Tibetan Pilgrims in the Swat Valley* which was one of the Society's commitments, was still in the Press by the end of the year. On the receipt side the Committee has to acknowledge with grateful thanks the donations of Rs. 500/- from the National Council of Education, Bengal, and the donation of Rs. 100/- each from Sir P. C. Ray, the respected President of the Society, and Dr. Narendra Nath Law, one of its esteemed members. Among other items, receipts under the head "Sale proceeds of books and pamphlets" showed an appreciable decrease as compared with the previous year, the figures being Rs. 415-12-6 (1936-37), and Rs. 543-8-9 (1935-36). This item, however, compares favourably with the figure for 1934-35, viz., Rs. 312-13-0. The

receipts from subscriptions showed a slight decline being Rs. 181-3-0 as compared with 229-13-0 for 1935-36 and Rs. 238-1-0 for 1934-35. On the expenditure side the publication expenses as usual have been the heaviest item, accounting for Rs. 740-10-0. With this may be compared the figures for previous years, viz., Rs. 648-8-0 (1935-36) and Rs. 925-4-9 (1934-35). Of the figure for 1936-37 no less than Rs. 677-5-6 was accounted for by the cost of publication of the two issues of the *Journal*. Under the head "Postal Charges" there was a slight increase in the expenditure, Rs. 118-13-3 as compared with Rs. 111-2-3 for 1935-36. It is, however, lower than the figure for 1934-35, viz, 150-13-6. A similarly slight increase may be noticed under the head "Allowance to Staff," the figure being Rs. 154-7-0 in place of Rs. 134-2-0 for the previous year. This increase, however, is more apparent than real as the figures include the Proof-reader's charges for the *Journal*. On the other hand, the charge under the head "Purchase of Books" shows a marked decline being Rs. 86-6-0 in place of Rs. 200-6-0 of the preceding year.

## LECTURES

During the year under notice 11 popular lectures were delivered under the auspices of the Greater India Society and in co-operation with the National Council of Education, Bengal. As in the preceding years the lectures covered a relatively wide range of topics. This may be shown from the subjoined list of subjects of the lectures to which is added the name of the lecturers in each case: Indus Civilisation and its Cultural Characteristics by Mr. Kunja Govinda Goswami, Ancient Bengal (2 lectures) by Mr. S. K. Saraswati, Aryan Invasion of India (2 lectures) by Dr. Batakriśhna Ghosh, Annam, Tonkin & Siam (3 lectures) by Swami Sadananda, Growth of Western Ideas about India (H. Goetz), Burma (2 lectures) by Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterji. The Committee conveys its sincere thanks to all

these gentlemen for their valued co-operation. Thanks are also due to the authorities of the National Council of Education, Bengal, for meeting as in former years the charges for the lectures.

## PUBLICATIONS

Two issues of the *Journal* (Vol. III, Nos. 1 and 2) appeared during the year, while the subsequent issue (Vol. IV, No. 1) appeared just in the following April. Of these the first issue which was brought out as a Sylvain Lévi Memorial Number besides receiving a prefatory notice from Dr. Tagore, the *Purodhā* of the Society, and an opening *prasaṣti* from Professor Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya, was enriched with original contributions from a number of Indian and foreign scholars, which swelled its size to the unusual number of 134 pages. The Committee feels that the *Journal*, by setting before itself a high scientific standard and by enlisting the co-operation of Indian as well as foreign scholars in its chosen field, is fulfilling a distinct need for the cause of Greater Indian research. A gratifying testimony to this effect is furnished by the growing response of scholars and scholarly periodicals in and outside India to the Society's call for co-operation. In this connection the Committee recalls with interest the invitation extended by the Eighth International Congress of Historical Sciences for representation of the Society at its forthcoming session at Zurich in August-September, 1938.

Turning to other items the publication of Dr. Tucci's long-awaited work, *Tibetan Pilgrims in the Swat Valley* was taken in hand during the course of the year. Mr. Himansu Bhusan Sarkar continued his preparation of the English translation of Dr. Krom's *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis* which is another of the Society's announcements.

## LIBRARY

During the year the Society's collection of books, periodicals, pamphlets, etc. continued to receive a constant stream of additions obtained by way of exchange with its *Journal* or for purpose of review therein. The collection continued to be housed in a room of the Asutosh Building of the Calcutta University which was generously placed at the disposal of the Society last year by the Vice-Chancellor, Mr. Syamaprasad Mookerjee, and his colleagues on the Post-Graduate Executive Committee. The works, as they came in, were duly entered in the Society's register of which two copies were kept.

## CONCLUSION

In concluding this brief review of working of the Society for the last year, the Committee cannot but offer its most grateful thanks to those friends and well-wishers who have helped it in various ways. Mention had been made elsewhere of the generous donations of the National Council of Education, Bengal, and of Sir P. C. Ray and Dr. Narendra Nath Law. Acknowledgment has also been made of the kind services of Mr. P. K. Sen, Hony. Auditor of the Society's accounts. The Committee has also to thank Mr. Ramananda Chatterji, Editor of *The Modern Review* and Dr. Narendra Nath Law, Editor of *The Indian Historical Quarterly* for free advertisements of the Society's publications in their well-known periodicals. To Dr. Law the Committee owes a further debt of gratitude for allowing a substantial discount on the printing charges incurred by the Society for its *Journal*. The Committee however feels that still more strenuous efforts should be made with a view to setting the Society firmly on its feet. Above all, recruits are needed for shouldering the growing responsibility of running the Society's *Journal* and of contributing to its outer publica-

tions. It is only thus that India will fulfil her duty of elucidating Greater Indian culture in a manner befitting her heritage. The Committee appeals to every educated son and daughter of India to help it in this noble task and it earnestly trusts that its appeal will not go in vain.

## **The Ninth All-India Oriental Conference.**

The ninth session of the All-India Oriental Conference was held at Trivandrum under the distinguished patronage of H. H. the Maharaja of Travancore on three successive days, 20th to 22nd December, 1937. It was attended by an exceptionally large number of delegates and visitors, of which some idea may be formed from the fact that no less than 90 institutions both in and outside India were-represented therein. It is a gratifying sign of the times that Greater India received a due share of attention in the composition of the Conference, for not only was it possible for the Greater India Society to send a fairly large number of delegates to the Conference but the notable delegates from abroad included Dr. W. F. Stutterheim, Director of Archaeology, Netherlands India. The session was opened in the presence of a distinguished gathering at the beautiful Town Jubilee Hall on the afternoon of the 20th December, when after the chanting of melodious Sanskrit verses and delivery of the Welcome address of the Chairman of the Reception Committee, His Highness the Maharaja addressed the audience in a felicitous speech which was much appreciated. This was followed by the learned address of Dr. F. W. Thomas whose speech was remarkable alike for the luminous survey of the existing state of Indological studies and for sage suggestions for future guidance. The successive days were devoted to meetings of the different sections of the Conference of which there were as many as thirteen this year. These comprised Vedic, Iranian, Islamic, Classical Sanskrit, Philosophy, Ardha-Māgadhī, Pali and Prakrit, History, Archaeology, Ethnology, Fine Arts, Kerala Art and Culture, Technical Sciences, Philology, Malayalam and other South Indian languages. In the Archaeology section the chief centre of interest was an exhibition of prehistoric and other antiquities



from Maski arranged by Mr. Ghulam Yazdani, the worthy Director of Archaeology in the Nizam's dominions. Greater India was worthily represented by Dr. Stutterheim whose paper on the *Cultural Relations between South India and Java* provoked a very interesting discussion and whose lantern lecture on the *Development of Indian Art in Java* roused a wide interest. Among other notable functions may be mentioned the lantern lecture of Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit on the *Indus Valley Civilisation* and of Dr. James Cousens on the *Post-mural Ajanṭā Paintings*. For the rest Drs. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee and U. N. Ghoshal and Mr. Jitendra Nath Banerjee among the delegates of the Greater India Society read papers at the different sectional meetings. A paper was also contributed by Mr. Banerjee to the meeting of the Numismatic Society of India which held its annual session simultaneously with the Oriental Conference. The Honorary Secretary took the opportunity to come into personal contact with Dr. Stutterheim and discuss with him plans for a closer co-operation between the Greater India Society and the Archaeological Department of Netherlands India. It is to be hoped that this will result in increasing the share of the Society's usefulness in the near future. The closing function of the Conference was a brilliant address from Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar, the Dewan of the State, followed by an interesting speech from the President. The busy days of the Conference were rendered very enjoyable to the assembled guests by a round of entertainments and festivities including a Garden party given by His Highness the Maharaja and a Dinner party at the residence of Mr. F. H. Skrine, Resident of the Madras States. Visits were also arranged to the notable institutions of the City, such as the State Museum and its unique Java-Bali Annexe, itself the fruit of Their Highness's recent visit to Indonesia. Very enjoyable trips were also arranged to the historic and picturesque sites of the State, such as Padmanābhapuram (the old Capital with its wonderful mediæval

fresco-paintings) and the majestic Cape Comorin. Altogether the session was a great success, for which our best thanks are due not merely to Their Highnesses the Maharaja of Travancore and the Maharani Setu Parvati Bai and the Dewan Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar, but also to the members of the Reception Committee including above all Mr. R. V. Poduval, the Local Secretary.

## **Reception to Dr. F. W. Thomas, Dr. H. J. Fleure and Dr. A. D. Mead.**

At the beginning of January 1938 the Indian Science Congress Association held its 25th (Silver Jubilee) session in Calcutta in collaboration with the British Association for the Advancement of Science. The opportunity was taken by the Managing Committee of the Greater India Society to organise a reception in honour of two of the distinguished overseas delegates, namely, Dr. F. W. Thomas and Dr. H. J. Fleure, as well as of Dr. A. D. Mead, Professor of Biology at the Brown University, U.S.A., who happened to be in Calcutta on the occasion. The pleasant function took place at the Mahabodhi Hall, College Square, on the 10th January 1938 at 6 p.m. and was attended by a fairly large number of persons. At the outset the distinguished guests were welcomed with suitable speeches by Drs. U. N. Ghoshal, S. K. Chatterjee, K. D. Nag and Pandit V. Bhattacharyya. Dr. Ghoshal welcomed Drs. Thomas and Fleure as representatives of British culture in the two important fields of Indology and Geography. He further eulogized the services of Dr. Thomas to the cause of Indian learning and the genial hospitality extended by him in his English home to Indian students visiting Europe. He concluded by recalling how Drs. Thomas and Fleure had just watched and blessed India's coming of age in the branch of Science. Pandit Bhattacharyya spoke of the high ideas of Buddhism which explained its phenomenal progress outside India, while Dr. Chatterjee spoke warmly of Dr. Thomas's kind interest in his studies while he was in Europe and Dr. Nag recalled his pleasant association with Dr. Thomas in England and Dr. Mead at the University of Honolulu. Replying to these addresses Dr. Thomas said that the Greater India Society was evidently animated by the same spirit of *karuṇā* and *maitrī* that was characteristic of Buddhism. In ancient times

the spread of Buddhism was due to individual enterprise of zealous missionaries. This kind of enterprise, continued the speaker, has lasted down to our own times—witness the Gujerati tombs of two or three centuries ago recently discovered at Uganda and the remains of Hindu culture at Baku. It may confidently be predicted that the same spirit of individual enterprise will continue in future for trade as well as for religious and cultural propaganda. Professor Fleure in course of his reply said that he was deeply impressed with the personality and teachings of Buddha. In this connection he pointed to the remarkable fact that fundamental, ethical and philosophical movements took place within a few centuries of each other in Ancient China, India and Judæa. He concluded by saying that the old message of the East was now wanted in the West which was machine-ridden. Prof. Mead, after highly complimenting Dr. Nag on his work as visiting Professor at the Honolulu University, observed that New World stood as much in need of India's ancient culture as the Old.

### **Notes of the last half-year.**

On the 23rd November 1937 Sir Jagadish Chandra Bose, the world renowned scientist, passed away suddenly at Giridih in the Hazaribagh District of Bihar. In common with numerous learned institutions both in and outside this country the Greater India Society mourned the death of India's illustrious son whom it was proud to reckon in its list of patrons. The Society will ever remember with gratitude his services during the infancy of its existence.

The Managing Committee of the Greater India Society is gratified to find signs of growing appreciation of its activities from the enlightened public of Bengal. In January last Dr. Bihala Churn Law, the well-known Buddhist scholar and patron of Indological studies in this city, earned the grateful thanks of the Committee by his generous gift of Rs. 500/- only, in favour of the Society.

In the last issue of the *J.G.I.S.* (Vol. iv, no. 2) was published a paper entitled *A new Inscription from Fu-nan* from the pen of Dr. G. Çœdès. In the accompanying text (p. 120) *ya[h\*]* in the first line should be read as *ya+* and *Jayavarmmaṇa* in the fifteenth line should be read as *Jayavarmmaṇa* ×, making foot-note no. 14 superfluous.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### China

Sirén, Osvald—*Eine führende Chinesische Bildhauerschule*  
(*Ost. Zeit.*, 13 Jaarg., 3/4 heft).

Thomas, F. W.—*A Buddhist Chinese Text in Brāhmī Script*  
(*ZDMG.*, Bd. 1, heft 1)

### Indo-China

Dupont, Pierre—*L'art du Kulen et less débuts de la statuaire  
angkorienne* (*BEFEO.*, t. XXXVIII, Fasc. 2)

Martini, François—*Dasa-bodhisatta-Uddesa*, texte Pāli Publié  
avec une traduction et un index grammatical (*Ibid.*)

Coral-Rémusat, Gilberte de—*Animaux fantastiques de  
l' Indo-Chine de l' Insulinde et de la Chine* (*Ibid.*)

### Indonesia

Bateson, G.—*An old temple and a new myth* (*Djawa.* 17  
Jaarg., afl. 5 en 6)

Belo, Jane—*Balinese Children's drawing* (*Ibid.*)

Goris, R.—*De Poera Besakih, Bali's Rijkstempel* (*Ibid.*)

*The Balinese Medical literature* (*Ibid.*)

Grader, C. J.—*Dorpsbestuur en tempelbeheer op Noesa  
Penida* (*Ibid.*)

Hunger, F. W. T.—*Einige aantekeningen over de Noord-  
Balische Bali-aga* (*Ibid.*)

Kaaden, W. F. van der—*Beschrijving van de Poeri Agoeng  
te Gianjar* (*Ibid.*)

Mc Phee, Colin—*Angkloeng gamelans in Bali* (*Ibid.*)

Moens, J. L.—*Śrīvijaya, Yava en Kaṭāha* (*Tijds. Indische  
Tal- Land-en Volk.* deel LXXVII, afl. 3)

Naerssen, F. H.—*Een Hindubalinesche Oorkonde gevonden  
in Oost-Java* (*Ibid.*, afl. 4)

*Twee koperen oorkonden van Balitung in Het Kol. Inst. te  
Amsterdam* (*Ibid.*)

- Neuhas, Hans—*Barong* (Djawa, 17 Jaarg., No. 5 en 6)  
*Sangijang-bumbung* (Ibid.)
- Noosten, H. H., & G. H. R. von Koenigswald—*Maskers en Ziekten op Java en Bali* (Ibid.)
- Sarkar, Himansu Bhusan—*The Cultural Contact between Java and Bengal* (IHQ., Vol. XIII, No. 4)
- Spies, W. & R. Goris—*Overzicht van dans en tooneel in Bali* (Djawa, op. cit.)
- Stutterheim, W. F.—*De Archæologische Verzameling Lijst van aanwinsten* (Jaarboek van Kon. Bat. Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, IV, 1937)  
*De Oudheden Collectie van Z. H. Mangkoenagoro te Soerakarta* (Djawa, 17 Jaarg., No. 1 en 2)  
*De Culture van Bali* (Ibid., No. 5 en 6)  
*Een inscriptie van Lombok* (Ibid.)  
*Oudheidkundige aantekeningen* (Ibid.)

### Malay Peninsula

- Archer, Raymond LeRoy—*Muhammadan Mysticism in Sumatra* (Journal of the Malay Branch RAS., Vol. XV, Pt. II)
- Braddell, Roland—*An Introduction to the study of the Ancient times in the Malay Peninsula* (Ibid., Vol. XV, Pt. II)
- Callenfels, P. V. van—*The Founder of Malacca* (Ibid., Vol. XV, Pt. II)
- Wilkinson, R. J.—*Further notes upon a study of Ancient Times in the Malay Peninsula* (Ibid.)
- Winstedt, R. O.—*Mr. R. Braddell's Ancient Times* (Ibid., Vol. XV, Pt. III)

### Persia

- Thieme, Paul—*Über Einige Persische wörter in Sanskrit* (ZDMG., Bd. 1, heft 1)

### Miscellaneous

- Hevesey, Gillaume de—*Noms ouraliens d'animaux dans l'Inde* (Journal Asiatique t. CCXXIX, Jan-Mars 1937)

### Additions to the Society's Library

The Greater India Society acknowledges with thanks the receipt of the following books, periodicals, pamphlets, etc. during the last six months.

#### Periodicals

- Adyar Library Bulletin (Brahma-Vidyā)* Vol. 1, Part 3, Vol. II, pt. 1, Madras 1937-38.
- Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* Vol. XVIII pt. IV, Vol. XIX, pt. 1, Poona 1937.
- Bijdragen tot de Taal-Lande-en Volk. Nederlandsch Indië*, deel 95, 's—Gravenhage 1937.
- Buddha-Prabhā*, Vol. 5, No. 3; Vol. 6, No. 1, Bombay 1937-38.
- Bulletin of the Colonial Institute of Amsterdam*, Vol. 1; No. 1 & 2, Amsterdam 1938.
- Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. IX, pt. 2, London 1938.
- Djāwā*, 17 Jaarg, No. 5 & 6; 18 Jaarg, No. 1-2, Jogjakarta 1937-38.
- Indian Historical Quarterly* Vol. XIII, No. 4, Calcutta 1937.
- Journal of the Annamalai University*, Vol. VI, No. 1, Annamalaiagar 1937.
- Journal of Indian History*, Vol. XVI, pt. 3, Madras 1937.
- Journal of Malay Branch R. A. S.* Vol. XV, pts. 2 & 3, Singapore 1937.
- Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, 13 Jaarg. 3/4 heft, Berlin 1937.
- Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 2 & 3, Bangalore City 1937-38.
- Tijdschrift Voor Indische Taal, Lande-en Volkenkunde*, deel LXXXVIII, afl. 1. Batavia 1938.

#### Books, Pamphlets, etc.

- Aiyappan, A, *Social and Physical Anthropology of the Nayadis of Malabar*, Madras 1937
- Alexéiev, Bar'le, *La Littérature Chinoise*, Paris 1937



- Braddell, Roland, *An introduction to the study of Ancient Times in the Malay Peninsula*, Singapore 1937
- Çœdès, G., *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, Hanoi 1937
- Family of Nations* (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), New York 1937
- Gonda, J., *Aanteeķeningen bij het Oud-Javaansche Bhīṣmaparwa*, Bandoeng 1937
- Kunst, J., *The Music of Java*, Amsterdam 1937
- Law, B. C., *Concepts of Buddhism*, Amsterdam 1937
- New Catalogus Catalogorum* (Skt. and allied works), 1st Fasc., Madras 1937
- Parks, H. C., *Hindūstānī Simplified*, London 1937
- Sadānanda, Swāmi, *Kāmboja (in Bengali)*, Calcutta 1937
- Steinhart, W. L., *Niassche Teksten*, Bandoeng 1937
- Takács, Zoltan de, *A Preliminary Report on a Far-Eastern Journey*, Budapest 1937
- Wales, H. G., *Towards Angkor*, London 1937
- Zes en Twintigste Jaarverslag* (Kon. Vereeniging Kol. Inst.), Amsterdam 1936

# THE JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

---

VOL. V

JULY, 1938

No. 2

---

**Contributions from the Mahāvamsa to our  
knowledge of the Mediaeval Culture  
of Ceylon.**

*By* DR. WILHELM GEIGER

(Continued from *J.G.I.S.*, Vol. V, No. I.)

V

## SOCIAL ORGANISATION

### **10. Racial and Social Differences within the Population of Ceylon.**

#### *A. Ārya and Drāviḍa*

58. The population of Ceylon was never so homogeneous as that of Northern India which had become such in the course of their historical development. There the Aryan immigrants who had come from the North-West gradually mixed with the original non-Aryan population of the country and finally absorbed it, so that a new race came into existence which we may call the Indo-Aryan race. It was spread all over the cultivated area of the country but it did not come into contact with people of a different race except perhaps in some frontier districts where the Indo-Aryans met with aboriginal hill- and forest- tribes.

The development turned out differently in Ceylon. Here there was ever a strong antagonism between the Aryan

and Drāviḍian races. This antagonism made itself more or less conspicuous in the different periods of Sinhalese history, but it was never entirely absent owing to the fact that the Aryans were the older stratum of colonists and the Damiḷas came over into the island as later immigrants, often also as foes and conquerors. Nevertheless the Sinhalese people cannot be called a pure Aryan race. From the beginning of the colonisation a racial mixture surely took place in Ceylon on the one side with the aboriginal inhabitants of the island, on the other side with the Drāviḍas of Southern India.

The first Aryan immigrants probably came to Ceylon from North-Western India in the 5th century B.C. The name or rather surname of their leader is called in the tradition Vijaya, 'the conqueror'. They met in Ceylon with a population of unknown race that was certainly neither Aryan nor Drāviḍian, but rather related to the uncultivated tribes of Southern India. This clearly appears from the fact that they are called *Yakkha* (Sk. *Yakṣa*) in the tradition. Another name seems to have been *Sabara* (Sk. *Śabara*), preserved in the modern name of the province *Sabaragamuva*. Both these names are used to denote barbarous tribes living in the mountains and forests. Often demoniac qualities are ascribed to them. Sinhalese *Yakā* simply means 'devil.'

It is very probable that the Aryan colonists often contracted sexual relations with aboriginal women. This seems to be alluded to by the legend told in the *Mahāvamsa* 7.9 sq. of Vijaya's marriage with the *Yakkhini* Kuveṇi or Kuvaṇṇā. According to the legend, she bore a son and a daughter. When afterwards she was put away by her husband and returned to the Yakkhas, she was killed by them, but her children fled to Malaya into the wild mountainous region of Central Ceylon. There they grew up and the elder brother took the younger sister for his wife and they became the ancestors of the Pulindas. The word *pulinda* too is a designation for uncultivated tribes in India,

here in Ceylon perhaps for a mixed race believed to have sprung from the intermarriage of the first Aryan colonists with aboriginal women. Such may perhaps be the actual kernel of the Vijaya-Kuveṇi legend.

59. But we also learn from the chronicle (Mhvs. 7.48 sq.) that messengers were sent by Vijaya to Madhurā, the capital of the Drāviḍian Pāṇḍu kingdom, in order to woo a daughter of the king for himself and also other girls as wives for his companions, and we are told that they came to the island and together with them craftsmen and members of the various guilds. This is an interesting notice, and it is not improbable that there is some truth in it. For the new colony was no doubt in want of such helpers and it is easy to understand that they were fetched from Southern India which geographically was the nearest cultivated country. Thus a strong infusion of Drāviḍian blood into the Aryan population of Ceylon must have taken place in the first period of its colonisation.

We know, however, that before long the Aryan element in Ceylon was strengthened by immigrants coming from North-Eastern India. According to tradition, the second ruler of Ceylon, Vijaya's successor, was the descendant of a Kalinga dynasty. From that time onwards an uninterrupted, nay, continually increasing intercourse appears to have existed between Bengal, Magadha, Orissa on the one side and Ceylon on the other side. In the third century B.C. the Buddhist doctrine was preached in Ceylon. The island became the home of orthodox Buddhism and it has remained so up to the present time.

The relations with the Damiḷas were very often hostile. The Sinhalese history (see above 30, *J.G.I.S.* III, p. 155 sq.) is a long series of bloody wars with Pāṇḍian (Mhvs. 50.12 sq.) and chiefly with Coḷa armies who invaded Ceylon in order to subjugate the island and its inhabitants. The Northern provinces were often occupied by the foe for many years, whilst the faithful adherents of the national dynasty found refuge in the less accessible province of Rohaṇa.

They always finally succeeded in restoring the independence of the Sinhalese kingdom.

We must also point to the fact that in Ceylon often when there were struggles for the throne, one of the candidates fled to Southern India, and having collected troops there, came back to the island and tried to win the kingdom with their help. Thus the custom arose in Ceylon, probably since the seventh century, of enlisting Drāviḍian mercenaries, *Damiḷas*, *Keraḷas* and *Kaṇṇāṭas* in the Sinhalese army. Their number seems to have been even greater than that of the less warlike Sinhalese. The Drāviḍian soldiery frequently caused serious disturbances. They revolted against their lord, chiefly when they were not sufficiently paid, plundered the country and seized the property of the peace-loving inhabitants (44, 134; 45.12 sq.; 54, 66). The worst time in this respect was the thirteenth century when, after the reign of the usurper *Māgha*, many *Damiḷa* mercenaries were dwelling as they pleased in the villages and single houses they had forcibly occupied. It was king *Vijayabāhu III*, 1232-36, who drove them out and freed at least the province of *Māyāraṭṭha* from those outrageous soldiers (81.14). Nevertheless they continued to be a public calamity under his successor *Parakkamabāhu II*, committing all sorts of violent deeds, until they were finally overthrown in a dreadful battle fought near the *Kālavāpi* tank and had to sacrifice their lives and all their accumulated treasures to the *Sihala* warriors (83.15-34).

60. Even in times of peace *Damiḷas* constantly came over to Ceylon where they earned their livelihood as merchants or artisans or perhaps as field-labourers. That at the end of the eighth century *Damiḷas* formed a constituent element of the population of Ceylon appears from a notice in *Mhvs.* 48. 145. There we are told how King *Mahinda II* presented bulls to lame people, no doubt for their conveyance. But if they were *Damiḷas*, he gave them horses, as they would not take cattle for that purpose.

When at the time of Sena I., 831-51, the Pāṇḍu king invaded Ceylon, all the Damiḷas who dwelled scattered here and there, went over to his side and he thereby gained great power (50. 15). From another passage (66. 133) we learn that in the twelfth century many Damiḷas were living in Ceylon in Gajabāhu's kingdom. Damiḷas were also often in a prominent position at the royal court. Two of the paramours of Queen Anulā. 12-16 A. C., were Damiḷas (34. 19. 24 sq.); one of them, Vaṭuka, was *nagaravaḍḍhaki*, i. e. chief of the guild of carpenters and masons (cf. R. Fick, *Social Organisation in North-East India in Buddha's Time*, translated by S. Maitra, pp. 283-4); the other, Niliya, even *purohita-brahmaṇa* (vide above 34, J.G.I.S. IV, 1937, p. 81 sq.). The Damiḷa Potthakuṭṭha in the service of King Aggabodhi IV., 658-74, was a person of great influence at court. After Aggabodhi's death he enthroned two successive puppet-rulers, whilst he himself administered the kingdom (46. 39 sq.). If my correction of the corrupt passage 49.24 is correct, there existed in Ceylon even a peculiar Damiḷa group of priests, *Damiḷa Bhikkhusaṃgha*.

In the harem of the Sinhalese kings there were also Damiḷa women. Soththisena, the son of King Mahānāma, was sprung from such a woman. He ascended the throne in the year 431, after his father's death, but was killed by Saṃghā, the daughter of Mahānāma and his queen, i. e. of an equal mother (38. 1-2). Vijayabāhu I., 1059-1114, wedded his younger sister Mittā to Paṇḍurāja (59.41). The name shows that the husband was an offspring of the royal family of the Pāṇḍu kingdom. Mānābharaṇa was the son of Paṇḍurāja and Mittā, and Mānābharaṇa's son was Parakkamabāhu the Great, who therefore on his grandfather's side had Drāviḍian blood in his veins.

Such marriages which were the issue of political considerations and became very frequent in the last centuries of the Sinhalese Kingdom (cf. 9, J.G.I.S. II, 1935, p. 100), did not much concern the Sinhalese people in

general. Nevertheless it is obvious that owing to the continual influx of *Damiḷas*, both soldiers and non-soldiers, the Sinhalese must have been considerably influenced by the *Drāviḍian* race not only culturally, but also physically and mentally. But a complete amalgamation of the two races never took place in Ceylon. The *Damiḷas* were always considered as foreigners, even in times of peace, and the Sinhalese never lost the consciousness of their Aryan descent and of their right of political independence. They even preserved their old Aryan language in spite of the geographical isolation. The dialect which the first colonists spoke was probably cognate to that in which the Western and North-Western inscriptions of Asoka are composed. In Ceylon it was influenced and enriched by dialects of Aryan immigrants who came from North-Eastern India, from Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, so that it became a mixed dialect which in the sequel developed on the same lines with all the Indo-Aryan vernaculars. A peculiar influence of Tamil was certainly not lacking, but it was not too strong. It is a remarkable fact that in the classical literature Tamil loan-words are rare in comparison with those borrowed from Pali and chiefly from Sanskrit. This clearly shows that the educated Sinhalese earnestly strove to emphasise the Aryan character of their language.

At the present time one-third (in round numbers) of the population of Ceylon consists of Tamils. The percentage may have been nearly the same perhaps a little less, also during the mediæval period.

### B. Classification of the people

61. Frequently in the *Mahāvam̐sa* the whole population of Ceylon is divided into *loka*, 'world' i.e. 'lay-congregation' and *sāsana* 'church', 'clergy', 'priesthood', often joined together in the compound *lokaśāsana*. Identical with this division is that into '*gihinō*.' 'laymen' and priests (*Mhvs.* 48. 23) and that into *vaṇṇā* 'castes' and *assamā* 'hermitages'

(72.145). Protecting and furthering of world and church was the first duty of a pious king (cf. 52-81; 68.2; 69.4 &c &c.).

We easily understand that division if we consider the dominant position of Buddhism in the island. According to its doctrine, perfect Buddhists are only those who having abandoned the worldly life have entered the Order and are striving for salvation. The laymen are but their helpers and protectors, acquiring thereby the merit (*puñña*) which warrants them a better future existence in the stream of transmigration. For those who believe in that doctrine mankind is divided into two large groups *viz.* priests or monks on the one side, and on the other side laymen who belong to the worldly community and are occupied with worldly tasks.

The word *sāsana*, it is true, is generally used in Pali to denote the Buddhist religion and the Buddhist Order, the *samgha*. But when it is put in contrast to *loka*, it must certainly have a wider sense and include the Brāhmaṇical clergy together with the Buddhist bhikkhus. It is obvious that the Brāhmaṇa priests cannot be considered as *loka*. We know that they played an important part at court and were by no means disregarded by the people in Ceylon (*vide* 33, 34; *J.G.I.S.* IV. 1937, p. 81 *sq.*); we learn this from the Mahāvamsa itself, though the chronicle was compiled by Buddhist priests.

The 'priesthood' itself was therefore *bi-partite*, consisting of *samaṇā* and *brāhmaṇā*. That *samaṇa* in this context means not an ascetic in general, but simply 'a Buddhist' priest is confirmed by the fact that we also meet with the twain *bhikkhavo brāhmaṇā* (50.5.)

62. The foremost social difference was that between *freemen* and *slaves* (*dāsa*). Slavery was a common institution in India up to the modern times, and the Indian law-books, the Kauṭaliya Arthaśāstra included, contain minute details concerning it. Four classes of slaves are distinguished in the Vinaya, ed. Oldenberg IV, 224<sup>38</sup>, seven in Manu-



smṛti VIII, 415, and fifteen in the Nāradaśmṛti (Breloer, *Kauṭaliya-Studien* II, p. 30 sq.). It is interesting that in the Nitinighaṇḍuva, a collection of customary laws in Ceylon, compiled about the year 1818 under British auspices (cf. Jolly, *Hindu Law and Custom*, translated by B. K. Ghosh, p. 95) the classification is the same as in the Vinaya: the first two classes are those who are born in the house (*antojāta*) or bought for money (*dhanakṛta*) the third, and fourth apparently those made prisoners in war (*ḥamara*) and carried off by force (*ānīta*).

It is easy to understand that we are unable exactly to trace this distinction in the chronicle, though it may have existed in mediæval Ceylon as well as in India. The first slaves were no doubt Damiḥas taken prisoners in war. King Silāmeghavaṇṇa, 617-627, after having beaten the Damiḥas who had invaded the island in order to conquer the kingdom for Sirināga, captured those who remained over from slaughter, subjected them to all kinds of humiliation and made them slaves (40.70-73).

Common to all Dāsas was the entire want of personal freedom. They were part of their lord's property in the same sense as money, fields and cattle. For their livelihood they were given a patch of land, called *diveḥ* in Sinhalese (H.W. Codrington, *Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon*, p. 18). In the houses of rich people, chiefly in the royal household, the number of slaves seems to have been very great. They could be given away to other people, if their lord liked to do so. Silāmeghavaṇṇa distributed the Damiḥa slaves he had made (see above) here and there to monasteries. Aggabodhi IV, 658-74, placed slaves at the disposal of the Bhikkhu community wherever they were wanted (46.10), and the Damiḥa Potthakuṭṭha who was serving the same king, having erected a splendid building in some monastery, could also assign it villages together with slaves (46.19). King Parakkamabāhu I assigned in the hospital built by him at Pulatthinagara, to each sick person, a male or female slave who had to attend on the patient

(73.34-36). Queen Kalyāṇavatī, beg. of the 13th century, built a monastery in the village Paṇṇasālā and granted it villages, fields and gardens, articles of use and slaves (80. 35-36). Her general Āyasmanta also created a *parivena* and supplied it with slaves, male and female (*dāśidāse* 80.39). Yet in the 18th century King Kittisirirājasiha is said to have assigned to the holy Tooth-Relic besides other precious presents, numerous villages and fields together with many slaves both male and female (100.11).

As we may infer from the chronicle, it sometimes happened that people who were indebted or unable to earn their livelihood, sold themselves and perhaps also their wives and children to their creditor or to some other rich man in order to maintain their existence. Under unfortunate circumstances this state could grow into permanent slavery. But, originally at least and on principle, it was temporary and could come to an end through redemption. Parakkamabāhu II is praised for having redeemed numerous people who had been enslaved during the despotic dominion of the usurper Māgha (87. 46-7).

There was always humiliation or abuse in the words *dāsa* and *dāsī* and they were, therefore, avoided at least by more sensitive people. King Aggabodhi VIII., 801-812, once addressed, probably in anger, one of his slaves with the word *dāsa*, but he afterwards repented of it; to make up for this, he allowed the slave to use the same word towards himself (49. 62). This story shows that we have no reason to assume that the slaves were always ill-treated in any way by their lords, much less than they were treated with cruelty. When the officials of a king call themselves his slaves, as in 70.202, this is, of course, a rhetorical humiliation.

In Sinhalese the word for female slave is *mīḍi* which derives from Sk. P. *muṇḍitā*, 'shaved'. This shows that in former times a female slave was not allowed to wear long hair, but had to shave her head when she was taken into a family.

63. A somewhat different social position was enjoyed by the *kammaṭṭhara*. The word is often combined with *dāsa*, even in the form of a compound, as also the corresponding Sk. word *karmakāra*. In the *Kauṭaliya* (2nd ed. Shama Sastry, p. 142, trsl. 178-9) the *Karmakāra-dāsāḥ* are enumerated as property of a man along with biped and quadruped animals; in the *Jātakas* (III, 129<sup>14</sup>) they are mentioned as belonging to the household of a rich merchant (R. Fick, *op. cit.*, translated by Maitra, pp. 262, 305). In the same manner according to the *Mahāvamsa Dāsas* and *Kammakaras* depended on a lord who had legal authority over them. In the disturbed times which preceded the reign of Parakkamabāhu in the 12th century, both classes revolted against their lords (*sāmino* 61.68). But the *Kammakaras* were not personally unfree like the slaves, though their freedom was limited by certain restrictions. They had to perform some work for their lord at regular intervals or certain occasions, as for instance during the harvest or when new buildings were to be erected. As payment for this service a small estate, a *divel*, was assigned to them, from which they could gain their livelihood. The labour was substituted for the rent. Sometimes *Kammaṭṭhara* is rendered by 'hired labourer,' but, I think, the translation 'serf' would be more appropriate.

The designation *kammaṭṭhara* does not imply humiliation as does the word *dāsa*. In a broader sense it can be used for any person who is bound to perform orders prescribed for him by a superior. Thus in 47.33 the petty officers of an army commanded by a general are called by this title; the same designation is used (46.13) by the chronicler for the *Damiḷa Potthakuṭṭha* at King Aggabodhi IV's court (cf. above 60). In such cases we have simply to translate the word as 'servant.'

The *Kammakaras* could, like the slaves, be given away to another lord. In this case they were appointed to render the new lord the same service that they had rendered formerly to the old one. Sena I., 831-51, is said in 50.64

to have granted slaves and serfs to a monastery he had built on the Aritṭha mountain. By King Vikkamabāhu II., 1116-1137, the 'royal workmen' (*rājakaṃmiḱā*, 62.43) were ordered to rebuild ruined temples and relic-shrines and destroyed tanks. Here probably the *kaṃmaḱaras* in the royal service are to be understood.

The word *kaṃmaḱara* ought not to be confounded with *kaṃmaḱāra*, the latter being no technical term but simply denoting a man who has to perform some work, a 'workman' in the most general sense.

64. Often, after all, a distinction is made in the chronicle between *kuḷinā* people of good family and '*hīnā*' 'people of the lower classes.' I need not say that this distinction concerns but the laity. In the later parts of the chronicle, from ch. 80 onwards, the word *kuḷina* is generally replaced by *kuḷaputta*.

Since *kuḷina* is derived from *kuḷa*, and *kuḷa* is used to denote a family or clan of the nobility, *kuḷina* means a nobleman. A few clans are mentioned in the chronicle by names: (1) Lambakaṇṇā, (2) Moriyā, (3) Kuliṅgā, (4) Taracchā, (5) Balibhojakā. The name of the Sihālā will be discussed separately. The five names quoted above denote animals: *lambakaṇṇa* is 'hare' or 'goat', *morīya* 'peacock', *kuḷiṅga* means a bird, the 'fork-tailed shrike', *taraccha* is 'hyena' and *balibhojaka* 'crow'. This clearly shows that the Sinhalese clans had a totemistic character. A peacock was, for instance, the emblem and perhaps the mythical ancestor of the Moriyas.

Of all these clans the *Lambakaṇṇas* were nearest to, and probably formed a branch of, the royal dynasty. Many of them wore the crown themselves in Ceylon, some already in ancient times and at the beginning of the mediæval period. This was the case with King Saṃghatissa and his successors between the years 362 and 431 A.C. In the seventh century *Lambakaṇṇas* were alternating with members of the royal family. Five *Lambakaṇṇas*, mentioned by name, were entrusted by Parakkamabāhu I with the

enlistment of soldiers for the army he wanted when beginning the struggle for the throne (69.12-13). In a religious feast celebrated by the same king Lambakaṇṇas played a part with other people of the noblest families (*mahākulinā*, 74. 213-4). It is noticeable that *Lambakaṇṇas* also existed in Southern India. They had to perform certain functions at the coronation festival of Virapaṇḍu in Madhurā, which was arranged by Parakkamabāhu I (77.25).

Next in rank to the Lambakaṇṇas seem to have been the *Moriyas*. With Dhātusena a scion of this clan ascended the throne about the year 460 A. C., and thereafter the *Moriyas* reigned over sixty years. The *Taracchas* and the *Kuliṅgas* apparently came to Ceylon along with the bough of the sacred Bodhi-tree which was planted at Anurādhapura in the Mahāvihāra (19.2). In the *Cūlavam̐sa* the *Taracchas* are mentioned only in 42.30. People of the *Taraccha* clan had to convey the statue of the therā Mahinda to the bund of the Mihindataṭṭa tank constructed by King Aggabodhi I, 568-601. About the end of the 12th century a *Kuliṅga*, Mahinda by name, treacherously slew King Vijayabāhu II., but he was himself killed after five days by the indignant inhabitants of the country (80.15. *sq.*). The *Balibhojaḥas* are mentioned but once in the later *Mahāvam̐sa* (85.1). Here the elders (*jeṭṭhā*) of the clan are said in 85.51 to have participated in a great festival, celebrated by Parakkamabāhu II in the thirteenth century. They had to fend off, it seems, by certain ceremonies or incantations all influences emanating from evil spirits which could disturb the course of the feast.

It is doubtful whether the name *monasīha* (90.7) also denotes a totemistic clan. The *monasīhas* were nine brothers who, bribed by the treacherous general Mitra, tried to murder the rightful heir to the throne Bhuvanekabāhu I, the son of Parakkamabāhu II. Non-totemistic is the clan-name *Girivam̐sa* (91.4), if this does not simply mean 'highland tribe.' A scion of the *Girivam̐sa* was the powerful minister Alagakkonāra of Vikkamabāhu IV.

There may have been more totemistic clans in Ceylon than the five enumerated above. But it is not necessary, I think, to assume that they were of non-Aryan origin. Totemism is a world-wide superstition and was by no means unknown to the ancient Aryans. Among the *gotra*-names there are many of totemistic character, which are taken from the names of animals or plants (H. Zimmer, *Studien zur Gesch. der Gotras*, Diss. Berlin 1914). The Kāśyapas are the 'tortoise-men' from Sk. *kaśyapa*. The name of the Māṇḍūkas is derived from *maṇḍūka*, frog; that of the Śaunakas, Auruṇavābhas, Kāpeyas from *śunaḥ*, 'dog,' *ūrṇanābhi*, 'spider,' *kaṇi*, 'ape;' that of the Āśvatthya from *aśvattha*, *ficus religiosa*, &c. Moriya, the name of Candragupta's and Asoka's clan, is the same word as *moriya* in the Mahāvamsa (cf. A. Grünwedel, *Buddhistische Kunst*, p. 72; Mhvs.-Tika, ed. Malalasekera I 180<sup>25</sup>). The form *maurya* is a Sanskritisation of the Middle-Indian *moriya*, and the name of Candragupta's mother *Murā* who became the female ancestor of the whole clan, is but an etymological invention in order to explain the Sk. word *maurya*.

65. The name *Sihala* is itself a totemistic clan-name. It refers to the oft-quoted legend of Sihabāhu, the son of a lion (*Sīha*) and a Vaṅga princess (Mhvs. 6.1 sq.). The home of this legend is Kālīṅga, it is therefore an Aryan legend. Sihapura (59.46) is the name of the Kālīṅga capital. When soon after the colonisation of Ceylon by Aryans the influence of North-Eastern India became decisive for the further development of its civilisation, the legend was combined with the story of Vijaya who was made the eldest son of Sihabāhu and given the name Sihala. The name was also conferred on his companions (7.42), and the original clan-name was thus amplified and it was used from that time onwards as designation of all the inhabitants of Ceylon. This is clearly shown by expressions like ruler of the Sihala (*Sihalādhīpa*), Sihala-language (*Sihalā nirutti*), &c. Ceylon itself was called *Sihala-dīpa*, 'Island of the Sihalas', as from ancient times *Laṅkā-dīpa*, and the Sihalas were often

contrasted with other people like *Damiḷas*, *Rāmaññas*, *Jāvakas*. But in 54.9-11 we have the interesting notice that King Mahinda IV., 952-72, had fetched from India a princess born in the clan of the *Kaliṅga* rulers and made her his first queen. Two sons and one daughter were borne by her, and thus Mahinda founded the *Sihala clan* (*Sihala-vamsam*). Apparently the remembrance of the old *Kaliṅga* legend concerning *Sihabāhu* and *Vijaya* along with his successors gave rise to this story. Thus the ancient clan-name was readopted by the Sinhalese kings in the mediæval period.

The foremost clan in Ceylon was the royal clan (*rāja-vamsa* 46.42; 52.16). The members of this clan traced their descent not from *Vijaya*, but from the fourth Sinhalese King *Paṇḍukābhaya* (Sinh. *Paḍuabhā*). According to the legend, *Vijaya* died without legitimate offspring; his successor was his alleged nephew *Paṇḍuvāsudeva*, a grandson of *Sihabahu*, who came from *Kaliṅga* (8.1 sq.). The historical kernel of the legend may be the fact, mentioned above in 59, that soon after the Aryan colonisation of Ceylon numerous immigrants came from India into the island. *Paṇḍuvāsudeva*'s daughter *Ummādacittā* is said to have had intercourse with young *Dīghagāmaṇi*, son of the *Sākiya* prince *Dīghāyu*, who had arrived in Ceylon during that king's reign. *Ummādacittā* gave birth to a son who was named *Paṇḍukābhaya*. This king and his descendants therefore belonged to the *Sākiya* (*Sakka*) clan from which the Buddha came forth. At the head of this clan stands the mythical King *Okkāka*, the *Ikṣvāku* of the Indian Epics, the founder of the Solar line. In Buddhist literature this line is traced yet further back to king *Mahāsammata*. We understand therefore that the legitimate Sinhalese kings regard as their ancestor either *Okkāka* (in inscriptions: *Oḱā-vas raj para-puren baṭ*=P. *Oḱkāka-vamsa-rāja-paramparāyā bhaṭṭha*) or *Mahāsammata* (Mhvs. 47.2), and that they often boast of their descent from the *Sākiya* clan, mentioning the Buddha's father *Suddhodana* as ancestor. The *Lambakaṇṇas* and

Moriyas were, I think, branches of the Solar line, and probably also other Sinhalese clans. They never seem to have been regarded as usurpers when they ascended the throne.

66. After this excursion into the legends and history of the Sinhalese clans I shall revert now to the differentiation between *kuḷinā* and *hīnā*.

Wherever the *kuḷinā* are mentioned in the chronicle, they are somehow or other connected with the royal family and with the government. They were the supporters of the kingdom and its tower of strength. From the *kuḷas* the officials were taken both in civil and military service, probably in hereditary succession. The greater landed proprietors also belonged to the nobility, in contrast with the leaseholders who cultivated parts of their property and had to pay a rent to the owner. Often the *kuḷinā* may have been the first settlers in any district of the country. They had for cultivation cleared the wilderness and founded a village which was inhabited by families of the clan and their descendants. This appears from the term *kuḷagāma* which occurs in 38.38.

It also happened that noblemen opposed the king. When in the fifth century the *Damiḷas*, altogether six rulers, held sway in Ceylon, most of the kinsmen of the noble families (*janā kuḷinā*, 38.12) betook themselves to *Rohaṇa* as their refuge. But some of them attached themselves to the *Damiḷas*. When *Dhātusena* succeeded in annihilating the foreign dynasty, he severely punished those treacherous noblemen by depriving them of their villages and leaving these villages defenceless.

The kings protected and furthered the noblemen for their own interest. *Vijayabāhu I.*, 1039-1114, is said to have chosen people of good family and charged them with his protection, and they were his permanent bodyguard (60.1). *Parakkamabāhu I* thought it his duty to protect those people of noble birth who had been ruined, by placing them in their rightful position (73.7). Women of good



family (*ḥulinā itthiyo*, *ḥulitthiyo*) were treated with much respect. King Udaya I, 792-7, used to present such women, if they were widowed (*anāthā*), with ornaments, and when they were in want, he handed them food at night (49.35). Vijayabāhu gave them villages, food and clothing according to their deserts (60.78).

The low-class people were, of course, first and foremost the Dāsas and Kammakaras and all the beggars and other poor people. They comprised probably also the leaseholders of smaller pieces of land who depended on the owner of the estate, and the lower artisans, such as blacksmiths, potters, washermen and others, who were considered to be the village-servants (*Sinhtovilkārayō*, H. W. Codrington, *Land Tenure*, p.1.)

It was always a symptom of decline, when people of the lower classes exerted influence on the ruler. King Sena V, 972.81, liked the company of low-class favourites *hinajā vallabhā janā*. He was induced by them to take intoxicating drinks and thus ruin his health, so that he died after a short reign while still youthful in years (54.70-72). In the greatly disturbed times during the first half of the twelfth century, the four princes who had occupied the different provinces slighted in their heedless way people of good family and placed ambitious men of lower classes (*hīnē jane*) in leading positions. The princes forcibly seized the possessions of the nobles who scattered here and there and hid themselves in divers places (61.50-52, 62). Mānābharaṇa<sup>2</sup>, lying on his deathbed, bitterly repented of having seized the treasures endowed by sons of good family to the Tooth-Relic and the relic of the sacred Alms-bowl (72.302 sq.)

It was Parakkamabāhu, afterwards surnamed the Great, who with a high hand made an end of this chaotic state of things.

## V. SOCIAL ORGANISATION

## 11. Caste-System

## A. Preliminary remarks

67. Hardly any part of the Indian culture has so frequently and so amply been discussed by scientists as the caste-system. It may be sufficient to refer here to the well-known and oft-quoted work of E. Sénart, *Les castes dans l'Inde, les faits et le système*, Paris 1896, and to that of R. Fick, *The Social Organisation in North-East India in Buddha's Time*, translated by S. Maitra, Calcutta, 1920.

The Indian caste-system, as it has been built up by the Brāhmaṇas and is described in the Brāhmaṇical literature, is no doubt to a large extent a theory and often out of keeping with facts. According to this theory, the Indian people are divided into four castes: *Brāhmaṇa*, *Kṣatriya*, *Vaiśya*, *Śūdra*. The first three are the light-coloured Ārya, the Śūdras the dark-coloured original inhabitants of the country who had been subjugated by the Aryan invaders. Hence the word *varṇa* 'colour' as designation of a caste. Each of the four castes had its peculiar profession: the Brāhmaṇas were the priests, the Kṣatriyas the warriors, the Vaiśyas the agriculturists and the Śūdras the artisans.

The tripartition of the Ārya is very ancient. It existed already in pre-Vedic times, for it is met with also among the Old Iranians. In the Avesta people are divided into priests (*atharvan*), warriors (*rathaēšta*, lit: one who fights from a carriage) and farmers (*vāstrya fšuyant*, lit: cattle-breeding agriculturist). The opposition to the non-Aryan aboriginal tribes (*dāha* &c.) is also emphasised in the Avesta.

The Brāhmaṇical theory of the four castes may have been adequate to the facts in the oldest Vedic period. The Aryan tribes which successively invaded North-Western India, were semi-nomads, while the original inhabitants were living in towns occupying a more advanced stage of

civilisation. The invaders occupied the open country for their agricultural purposes; the non-Aryans, called *dasyu*, had to work for them as craftsmen. This was the first line of demarcation, separating the conquerors from the subjugated Dasyus. Among the Ārya the priesthood had its prominent position since pre-Vedic times. The bulk of the people engaged in cattle-breeding and agriculture and they enjoyed the protection of the most warlike families. These 'warriors' were probably also land-owners, but, being engaged in martial exercises, they did not cultivate their lands themselves but got them cultivated by the farmers as payment for protection.

In the course of historical development, when the Aryan rule was established in Northern India, the Brāhmaṇical theory more and more ceased to be in accordance with the actual conditions.

The Brāhmaṇas, it is true, continued to lay claim to superiority and remained a close caste. But many of them could not earn their livelihood by priestly work and were compelled to go in search of some worldly occupation. The Kṣatriyas were no longer 'warriors', when the conquest of the country was finished and the race of the aboriginal inhabitants was absorbed by that of the invaders. But they kept alive their glorious family traditions and were conscious of their descent from the victorious classes under whose leadership the Aryans had conquered their new dwelling-places. They split up into many clans which sometimes came into conflict with one another by rivalry. Gradually they became the ruling class in the state, the nobility and the representatives of political power with the king at their head. In the eyes of the people they were no doubt superior to the Brāhmaṇas, and in the whole Buddhist literature the, Kṣatriyas are always assigned the first place in the list of castes. They even emulated with the Brāhmaṇas in learning and religious study and were the proper guardians of the deep thoughts contained in the Upaniṣads.

68. Yet more far-reaching were the changes and innovations in the Vaiśya and Śūdra castes. Owing to the progressive amalgamation of the races the distinction between these two castes was more and more effaced. Moreover, many Aryans were unable to gain their living by agriculture and had to learn arts and handicrafts from those whom their ancestors had subjugated. Thus, although they originally ranked among the Vaiśyas, they were on a level with Śūdras and their social position began to depend on the more or less reputable character of their occupation.

With the progress of civilisation new professions came up and their representatives were anxious to separate themselves from those whom they considered to be lower in status owing to their pursuit of a less reputable occupation. The two old castes were thus gradually split into numerous professional groups which could be called *vaṇṇā* 'castes', but in a modified sense of this word.

By intermarriage of persons belonging to different groups new castes were formed, so that their number was constantly increasing. The rigid Brāhmaṇical caste prescriptions, however, concerning endogamy, heredity, purity and pollution and the like, were by no means forgotten, but were observed in the Brāhmaṇa caste and transferred in the Kṣatriya caste to the single families and clans, and in the lower classes to those numerous professional groups.

Such seems to have become the social organisation in the Buddhist times, and it has been depicted with the help of the Jātakas in an admirable manner by R. Fick in the work quoted above. It would be erroneous to look upon the Buddha as a social reformer who destroyed the severe limits fixed by caste in India. He merely taught the worthlessness of caste as means of acquiring salvation. The Buddhist Order was open irrespective of caste to all individuals, who having abandoned the worldly life were striving for Nirvāṇa. For the members of the Order caste rules had ceased to exist, but they did not lose their

rigidness for the laymen. The Brāhmaṇical theory was so strongly embedded in the minds of the Buddhists that they spoke of it and discussed its value in their literature, though they were certainly well aware of its incongruity with the real facts of life.

69. The first Aryan immigrants in Ceylon, of course, brought with themselves into their new home the tradition of a social organisation conforming to that which existed at that time (about the 4th century A. C.) in Northern India. It must have been very similar to the organisation depicted in the Jātakas. Owing to the uninterrupted traffic with North-Eastern India it developed in Ceylon on the same lines as there. The Brāhmaṇical theory of the four castes has not entirely lost its vitality in mediæval Ceylon and the old phraseology connected with the institution is sometimes preserved in single cases. Yet at the beginning of the 13th century the expression 'the four castes' (*catubbaṇṇā*, Mhvs. 80. 41) occurs as paraphrase for the whole of society. They had become impure by mixture (*saṃkīṇṇa*), but were scrupulously separated and purified by Āyasmanta, the general of queen Kalyāṇavatī. This notice points in conventional form to a social upheaval caused by inter-marriages between families of lower and higher classes which were repugnant to a more conservative and aristocratic mentality. Even in the *Nīti-nighaṇḍuva* (cf. above in 62) four castes are distinguished, though they did not exist in reality for many centuries past. But it is remarkable that instead of the *Śūdras* the *Goyi-vaṃsa*, the caste of agriculturists, is put in the fourth place.

If we leave aside the comparison with India and simply try to depict the social organisation in Ceylon from the *Mahāvam̐sa* we see that the bifurcation of the society into *loka* and *sāsana* and again that of the laity into *kulīnā* and *hīnā* (cf. above, 64) plays a much more important part than caste according to the Brāhmaṇical system. This may partly be due to the fact that the chroniclers were Buddhist priests who did

not care much for caste, but it also seems to point to a social development beyond the stage described in the Jātakas. The final result of that development comes out in modern times, when, after the fall of the native kingdom, both the Brāhmaṇa caste and the nobility inseparably connected with it has entirely disappeared from the Sinhalese society. According to Cordiner, *Description of Ceylon*, I, 1807, p. 93, there existed in Ceylon only professional castes, nineteen in number who all live as distinct tribes, and intermarry only with persons of their own rank and profession. Enumerated according to their rank they are : 1. agriculturists, 2. keepers of cattle, 3. fishers, 4. toddy-drawers, 5. mechanics (such as carpenters and goldsmiths), 6. tanners, 7. potters, 8. washers, 9. cinnamon-peelers, 10. porters, 11. sieve-makers, 12. barbers, 13. lime-burners, 14. tom-tom beaters or drummers, 15. makers of charcoal, 16. palanquin-bearers, 17. mat-weavers; 18. executioners and 19. Rodiyas are outcastes.

### B. Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas

The Brāhmaṇas (synon: *vippa*=Sk. *vipra*, *dija*=Sk. *duija*) were always priests and their privilege was the performance of the religious rites prescribed in the Vedas. They were honoured and supported by the king in the same manner as the Bhikkhus, and we know already the important and influential position which the Brāhmaṇas, and foremost the Purohita, had at the royal court (cf. above 34, *J.G.I.S.* IV, 1937, p. 81 sq.). Near his palace king Parakkamabāhu I erected two buildings which were reserved for Brāhmaṇical purposes. In the building called *hemaman-dira*, 'Golden House' the Brāhmaṇa priests performed the ceremonies of expiation in the *dhāraṇīghara* 'House of spells' they recited magic incantations (Mhvs. 73. 71).

The rôle the Brāhmanas played at court clearly shows the admirable vitality of their theories and doctrines, and it indicates how deep-rooted they were still in the minds

of the Indo-Aryans many centuries after they had lost their practical consequences. But not all Brāhmaṇas in Ceylon were living at court and serving the king. The Hindu cult, though considerably inferior to Buddhism, was not persecuted there or annihilated. Temples of Śiva and Viṣṇu stood in the towns; they have been detected amid the ruins of Polonnaruva and partly restored. In all these sanctuaries no doubt Brāhmaṇas were officiating, and they certainly also displayed much activity in all sorts of charms, augury and astrology, belief in which even in modern times is wide-spread in Ceylon. Among the spies sent out by prince Parakkamabāhu when he wished to find out the actual conditions in Gajabāhu's country, there were also people disguised as Brāhmaṇas and ascetics (*tāpasā*, 66, 132, 135). They were wandering like unto pious pilgrims from village to village in order to take the opportunity of investigating and influencing the political views of the people.

One thing, however, remains doubtful. It is a well-known fact that in post-Vedic times many members of the Brāhmaṇical caste in Northern India had to earn their livelihood by non-priestly more or less reputable occupations. But they did not lose their caste, for they belonged to it by birth. Such Brāhmaṇas are aptly called 'worldly Brāhmaṇas' by R. Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 192 sq., 212 sq. If such Brāhmaṇas existed at all in Ceylon, they were certainly few in number. I can only quote one expression in the whole chronicle which perhaps may refer to worldly Brāhmaṇas; that is *vanibbino-brāhmaṇa* in 73. 32 (cf. below 77 subfinem). It is true, the percentage of Brāhmaṇists as compared with Buddhists was no doubt smaller in Ceylon than in Bengal or Orissa, and the chances of living by priestly function alone were yet smaller than in India. But, on the other hand, in a country where Buddhism was so predominant as in Ceylon, it was perhaps easier and not so dishonourable for a Brāhmaṇa, when he was reduced to poverty, to leave his caste and to enter into one of those professional groups which had come into existence in the

Buddhist era as branches of the former Vaiśya and Śūdra castes.

71. The word Khattiya=Sk. Kṣatriya, frequently occurs in the mediæval Mahavamsa, but it does not denote the warrior caste or even a caste at all. The caste, as we have seen, was split up into a great number of families or clans (*ḷula*, *vaṃsa*, *gotta*) who often rivalled and sometimes were even at feud with one another; wars were fought by a militia called out in times of emergency and by an active army of mercenaries. The Khattiya is simply a man of the highest class, a nobleman, a prince. Synonyms with *ḷhattiya* are *bāhuja* (Mhvs. 59. 2) and *rājañña* (89. 27)=Sk. *rājanya*. The former reminds us of the old Bhāhmaṇical legend, according to which the Kṣatriya caste sprang from the arm of the god Brahmā. The latter is met with in the triad *rāja-rājañña-mantino*, 'king, noblemen and dignitaries,' who are the firm foundations of the state.

Frequently the title *ḷhattiya* is given by the chronicler to the prince who in legal succession ascends the throne. Such phrases as 'now his brother next in age, the prince (*ḷhattiyo*) Kassapa became king' (48. 20) often occur in the older part of the Cūlavamsa. At the head of the whole nobility stands the king. In 73. 137 Parakkamabāhu I. is glorified as 'the highest flag of the Khattiya clans' (*ḷhattiya-vams'-cḷaketu*) and in inscriptions of the tenth century kings are called 'the pinnacle of the Khattiya clans' (*ḷat-ḷula-ḷot*=P. *ḷhattiya-Kula-ḷunta*) as for instance Kassapa IV and Dappula IV. (Ep. Z, II 41A.<sup>1-5</sup>, III 127A.<sup>2-4</sup> Or they even boast of 'having made the other Khattiya clans their vassals' (*an ḷāt-ḷula pāmili ḷaḷa*=P. *aññe ḷhattiya-ḷule pādu-mūle ḷaḷa*) as Udaya III (II) and Kassapa V. (Ep. Z, III, 193A;<sup>6-7</sup> I 221'). The peculiar title 'Great Lord' (*mahā-sāmin*) seems to have been reserved to the scions of the royal clan.\* Dappula, an offspring of Okkāka, afterwards king Dappula IV., 650 A.C., is given this title in 45. 50, and in 57. 24; 30, 49); it is given to all the noblemen born in the clan of Mānavamma who was a descendant of the same mythical king.



72. The Khattiyas had their own laws, the *khattadhamma* (Mhvs. 67. 91.). Versed in these laws valid for the nobility, prince Parakkamabāhu, at a favourable constellation, celebrated the festival of the binding on of the frontlet denoting the rank of a Mahādipāda. We do not hear much in the chronicle about the details of those laws. The marriage-rules may have been included in them. There existed no strict endogamy within the single clans. Examples of intermarriage between them are often reported. A younger sister of the Moriya Moggallāna I., 496-513, was the consort of the Lambakaṇṇa Silākāla (39. 44-5; 41. 7; J. Still, *Index to the Mahāvamsa*, p. 81, III). Moggallāna, the son of prince Kassapa (afterwards king Vikkamabāhu I.) and father of Kittī (afterwards king Vijayabāhu I.) was a scion of the royal clan and bore the title 'Great Lord' (57. 29-30). He married Lokitā<sup>2</sup> who was the daughter of Bodhi (57. 41), a descendant of the Lambakaṇṇa Dāthopatisa. Mahinda IV., 956-72 is said to have fetched a princess from Kālīṅga and made her his queen, though there was a race of Khattiyas in Laṅkā' (54, 9). It is implied in this notice that he could woo as an equal consort a daughter of each of the Khattiya clans in Ceylon.

Equality of birth was the first requisite in a nobleman's marriage, and all the Khattiya clans were equal to each other. As to the intermarriage of the Sinhalese royal family with foreign dynasties I refer to what is said above in 2-3, *J.G.I.S.* II, 1933, pp. 91-93\*). The Solar and the Lunar line (Kālīṅga and Pāṇḍu) were considered to be equal to the Sinhalese kings, but not the dynasty of the Coḷas, nor the Ārya line of the Rājputs.

At all events the most aristocratic marriage seems always to have been that with a daughter of the same clan. In several inscriptions (cf. Ep. Z, I 221<sup>2</sup>) it is emphasised that Dev Gon (the Queen of Kassapa V., 913-23) was of the

\* I wish to correct a mistake on p. 93. We have to read on l. 15 'daughter' (of Jagatipāla) instead of 'consort' and on l. 16 'Lilāvati's (daughter)' instead of 'his.'

same family (*e-mā kulen*=P. *ten'eva kulina*) and therefore equal to him in birth (*sama-dā*=P. *sama-jāti*). Is this perhaps the reminiscence of an older endogamous Khattiya-law?

That certain rules were observed by the Khattiyas as regards eating is shown by a story narrated in 47. 9. *sq.* We learn from it that a Khattiya would never eat remnants of a Khattiya meal, for then he would admit himself to be of a lower caste. Prince Mānavamma, when he lived as a refugee in Southern India, was riding one day with his friend the Pāṇḍu king Narasiha on the back of the same elephant. Narasiha, feeling thirsty, drank a cocoanut and then gave it to his friend. Mānavamma hesitated to accept it owing to the clan regulations, but finally he made up his mind to drink. Narasiha at once understood the mistake he had made and drank now himself in turn what Mānavamma had left. Thus it was manifest that they considered one another to be equal in rank.

### C. Professional Castes and Outcastes

55. In the old Mahāvamsa (3. 3) *Vessas* (Sk. *Vaiśya*) and *Suddas* (Sk. *Śūdra*) are mentioned side by side with the Kṣatriyas and Brāhmaṇas. They all were present when the body of the Buddha was burnt at Kusinārā. Here we meet with the ancient Brāhmaṇical theory of the four castes. The word *vessa* is also preserved in the name of the famous monastery Vessagiri near Anurādhapura. The name is explained in Mhvs. 20. 15 by the legend that five hundred Vessas were dwelling in the monastery after they had been admitted into the Order by the therā Mahinda.

Notices of such kind are missing in the mediæval parts of the chronicle. The word *sudda* does not occur at all in the Cūlavamsa, while *vessa* occurs in one passage only, 76. 264, which however does not refer to Ceylon, but to South-India. The Vessas and the Yavanas of the Pāṇḍu kingdom are related to have brought presents to the victorious general of Parakkamabāhu I. who distinguished them by

countless marks of favour. The Vessas denote here the peaceful agriculturists who had suffered much by the war, and the Yavanas probably the Moorish traders who were carrying on their business in South-India as well as in Ceylon. Cf. E. R. Ayrton, *Note on the Mahawansa* (Ceylon Notes and Queries I, Oct. 1913, p. VIII).

The general word by which all kinds of occupation, arts and handicrafts, are expressed, is *sippa* (Sk. *śilpa*). People who understood or practised any art or handicraft are called *sippino* or *sippikā*. These words also frequently occur in the canonical Buddhist literature and in the Jātakas.

When in the thirteenth century Vijayabāhu, who had taken over the burden of the government at his father's (Parakkamabāhu II's) order, wished to restore the temple of the Tooth-Relic at Jambuddoṇi, he fetched from all parts of the kingdom many groups of artists (*bahū sippigaṇe*) experienced in every branch of art. Many artists (*bahū sippijanā*) were also employed by the same ruler in the restoration of the buildings of Anurādhapura (88. 13, 85).

Concerning North-Eastern India during the brightest time of Buddhism R. Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 327, says: 'The distinction between castes (*jāti*) and occupations (*sippa*) has gradually been obliterated and in modern times has been almost wholly abolished.' We may add that the process has practically come to an end in mediæval Ceylon. Caste means a group of families practising the same profession, the profession most probably being hereditary. In connexion with this change the old terms *vaṇṇa* or *jāti* become more and more obsolete and are replaced either by *sippa* or by the more general words *vagga* (Sk. *varga*) or *gaṇa* (Sk. idem) both meaning 'group'. These groups may be called 'castes'—in the modern sense, of course—for the ancient caste rules and prescriptions were transferred to them, as we see from the constitution of the Sinhalese castes at the time when British rule was established in Ceylon.

74. A peculiar term in mediæval Ceylon for artisans or a sort of craftsmen is *pessa* or *pessiya* (*pessika*). The word

has its history in the Pali literature. It means one who does not work on his own account as the agriculturists do but on another person's service. In Suttanipāṭa 615 (quoted by R. Fick, p. 221) we read :

*Yo hi koci manussesa parapessena jīvati |  
evam, Vāseṭṭha, jānāhi, pessiko so, na brāhmaṇo ||*

Whoever among men ekes out a living through service which he renders to others, know this, Vāseṭṭha, is a Pessika and no Brāhmaṇa.

In SN.651 *pessika* is put together with *kaṣaṇa* agriculturist, *sippika* artist and *vāṇija* merchant. As the craftsmen are no doubt included in the term *sippika*, the word *pessika* must be rendered here by 'servant', 'slave' or the like, and this is indeed its meaning in the canonical literature. *Pessa* is frequently joined with *dāsa* and *kammaṇa*, standing between the two: *dāsā ti vā pessā ti vā kammaṇā ti vā* (D. I. 141<sup>30</sup> S I 76<sup>3</sup> &c.) and S I 93<sup>5</sup> after them in a verse: *dāsā kammaṇā pessā*. In DCo I 300<sup>28</sup> *dāsā* is explained by *antojātādayo* 'those who are born in the house and the others', i.e. the four classes of slaves (see above 62), *pessā* by *ye pubbaṃ dhanam gahetvā kammaṇā karonti*, 'who do their work after having received money before', and *kammaṇā* by *ye bhattavetanam gahetvā karonti*, 'who do (the work) after having received food as wages'.

In the Jātakas VI 448<sup>14</sup> *pessiya* means 'attendant, servant, soldier', the fem. *pessiyā*, *kā* VI 65<sup>12</sup>, 67<sup>9</sup> 'slave-girl', and *para-pessiyā* 'rendering service to another' is III 413<sup>20</sup> adjunct to *dāsī*. The word *pessa-kāra* VI 356<sup>19</sup> means 'subordinate servant'.

We must start from the meaning 'rendering service to another', if we wish to understand the peculiar use of the word in the Cūlavamsa. Here the *Pessiya* is never put side by side with a slave or a serf, but he is simply a man who 'renders service to another' by manufacturing articles or by doing any other work for people who pay him or his service. In short *pessa*, *pessiya* means *craftsman*,

and this meaning occurs already in Jāt. VI 374<sup>6</sup> where by *pessaḥamma*, 'a craftsman's work', that of a potter, is meant.

By the name *pessa* the craftsman is contrasted with the agriculturist or the cattle-breeder who works for himself and on his own account. From this contrast again follows a differentiation of rank within the series of castes. The Pessiya are the 'servants' of the village and therefore of lower rank (*hīnā*) lower at all events than the villagers to whom they render service.

Five (or ten) groups or castes of Pessiya, *pañca* (or *dasa*) *pessiya-vaggā*, are mentioned in the chronicle, but they are never named. According to Wijesimha, *Mahāvamsa* trsl., 1889, p. 94 and 144 n. the five castes are the carpenters, weavers, dyers (or washermen), barbers and workers in leather (or shoemakers). I accept this as correct, for I suppose that W. has followed a tradition prevalent in Ceylon. It is regrettable that he did not notice which castes are meant by *dasa pessiya-vaggā*.

Craftsmen of the same profession were often living together in one village (R. Fick, p. 280 sq.). A village of weavers is mentioned in Mhvs. 41.96, villages of potters and masons in Mhvs. Tikā, ed. Malalasekera, pp. 483<sup>2</sup>, 606<sup>23</sup>. Such villages with the fields appertaining to them are often assigned to the craftsmen as payment for the service they had constantly to render to some community of higher class. The payment could however also consist in coin or in food, clothes and ornaments (cf. 27.22-23; 30.14, 18-19).

The Pessiya castes were also connected with the royal court. The king with his family and his immediate entourage enjoyed the service of craftsmen who were skilful in an extraordinary degree and did not work for other people. When prince Parakkamabāhu, after his return from Pula-tthinagara arrived in Dakkhiṇadesa, his uncle Kittisirimegha despatched representatives of those *pañca pessiya-vaggā* to meet him (67.58). As soon as the prince had entered

his own country, he was to be surrounded and attended to by the retinue due to each member of the royal family.

When afterwards Parakkamabāhu II (1236-71) reorganised the kingdom, he also 'settled' or 'rearranged' (*niyameivā ṭhapesi*) the five and the ten Pessiya castes who belonged to the royal household (*rājaḥkulāyatte* 84.5). We may assume that in the preceding times of disturbance they had neglected their duties or not performed them in the prescribed manner; perhaps they had also served other persons for money. This is the only passage of the chronicle where the *dasa pessiya-vaggā* are mentioned.

The five Pessiya castes could also be granted by the king to a monastery (57.21) just as slaves or serfs. In this case the artisans who had formerly served the king were now to do their work for the monks of the monastery, but they received payment from the king.

75. We are not able to give, with the help of the Mahāvamsa, a complete list of the craftsmen existing in mediæval Ceylon and of their castes. They are mentioned here and there in different connexions. In Mhvs. 88.105 sq. many workmen are enumerated who were employed in the reign of Parakkamabāhu II. in the thirteenth century for restoring the ruined buildings of Pulatthinagara. They are (1) the workers in iron (*ayaḥkāṛā*), (2) the turners (*cunda-kāṛā*) and (3) the workers in bamboo (*vilivākāṛā*). We do not know how the *ayaḥkāṛā* differ from the *ḥammārā* to be mentioned presently. The word *vilivākāṛā* is used in SCo I 93<sup>30</sup> as explanation of *veṇaḥkula*. The second group are (4) the blacksmiths (*ḥammārā*), (5) the coppersmiths (*loha-kāṛā*) and (6) the goldsmiths (*soṇṇakāṛā*). They are also mentioned in 68.25, in the rather strange notice that prince Parakkamabāhu for erecting a dam in a big irrigation-work called together these three classes of smiths, because there was a lack of stone-cutters (*silā-koṭṭakā*) in the district.

The third group are (7) the potters (*ḥulālā*, the same as *ḥumbhaḥkāṛā*) and (8) the painters (*cittakāṛakā*). Between the two the *ḥalādā* are mentioned, and it seems that we must

assume a meaning for this word different from that of Sk. *kalādā* 'goldsmith.' The fourth and probably most important group is that of the masons (*vaḍḍhakī*): (9) the *workers in cut-stone* (*silā-vaḍḍhakī*), (10) the *brick-layers* (*iṭṭhikā-vaḍḍhakī*) and (11) the *workers in stucco* (*cuṇṇa-vaḍḍhakī*). To them (12) the *carpenters, workers in timber* (*dāru-vaḍḍhakī*) are added. The *bhārikā* 'porters' and the *bhatakā* 'hirelings' were employed in the work together with slaves and outcaste people.

Other craftsmen, such as the *weavers* (*pesa-kāraḥā 41.96*) and the *barbers* (*kaṇṇakā, nahāpakā*), are mentioned occasionally. The barbers appear to have been more in fighting trim than our barbers generally are, for with court-officials, hunters and chamberlains they were among the king's hunting-train (70.44) and prince Parakkamabāhu is said to have given arms to young barbers and chamberlains, so that they formed a kind of bodyguard (69.26). The *hunters* (*luddā, luddakā*) armed with spears and nets, were employed as drivers in a king's hunting-party (70.35). But wherever *vyādhā* are mentioned in the chronicle, no professional Sinhalese hunters are meant, but Vāddās, i. e. tribesmen of the aboriginal race.

Not mentioned in the *Cūlavamsa* are the *washermen* and the *fishermen*. The former apparently played a role in the familiar life of the Sinhalese; the latter are divided in the older part of the chronicle into two classes; those who catch fish with bait (*bālisikā 22.62*) and those who catch them with nets, (*kevaṭṭā 28.37*).

76. The most numerous and highly respected castes were no doubt the *agriculturists* (*kaṣṣakā*) and the *cattle-breeders* (*gopakā*). This is just the reason why they so seldom are expressly mentioned in the chronicle. All the 'inhabitants of the country' (*jānapadā*), if they were not reckoned among the *Pessiyas*, were members of one of these two castes.

The *traders and merchants*, (*vāṇijā*) also seldom occur in the *Cūlavamsa*. This can partly be ascribed to the fact

that even in mediæval Ceylon as now-a-days a good deal of the commercial traffic was in the hands of Arab traders, the 'Moors' (cf. above 72). They were called Yavanas or Yonas. It is certain that under this term all the Western nations are comprised, not only the Greeks. If we are told in Mhvs. 10.90 that already at the time of Paṇḍukābhaya a separate quarter existed in Anurādhapura, called Yonasabhāgavatthu, we can assume that this was a kind of ghetto for those foreign traders. When Parakkambāhu I's General Rakkha on the march to Rohaṇa approached the town of Vālukāgama, the modern Vāligama, he promised security to all who would make voluntary surrender. The merchants (*vāṇijā*) residing there surrendered willingly, because life and money were dear to them (75.44 sq.). Perhaps these merchants were a colony of foreigners. At the beginning of the modern era the Portuguese (*Paraṅgi*) and the Dutchmen (*Olandā*) were also considered to be such traders (95.4-5 ; 99.108-9).

A prominent class within the society were the *great bankers* (*seṭṭhino*). Their position will probably have been the same as that of the *Seṭṭhins* in the Jātakas. Cf. R. Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 258 sq. They stood, no doubt, in close proximity to the royal court. Of three brothers who revolted against king Vijayabāhu I., 1059-1114, one was a *seṭṭhinātha* a chief of the *Seṭṭhins* (59.16). In 69.13 *Seṭṭhināyaka* is the name of a Lambakaṇṇa ; it was probably his title.

The *Seṭṭhins* seem to have been connected with the *guilds* (Sk, *śreṇi*, P. *seṇi*). Perhaps they were the foremost guild. It is said in the *Harivaṃsa śreṣṭhipūrvāstu śreṇayah* 'the guilds have at their head the *Śreṣṭhins*' (BR. s. v.). Guilds are also mentioned in the Jātakas (cf. R. Fick, *op. cit.*, p. 275. sq.), but it is difficult to draw from the text inferences concerning their constitution or organisation and their relation to the castes. In the older Mahāvamsa 7.57 the number of the guilds is stated to be eighteen. The same number is given in Jāt. VI 427<sup>11</sup> and in Mahāvastu (ed. E. Senart) III, 1144<sup>4</sup>. In the Cūlavamsa guilds are never



mentioned, so that we cannot say with certainty that they existed in mediæval Ceylon.

77. Great was the number of casteless wandering traders or craftsmen and other people of this sort in Ceylon. There is a highly interesting passage in Mhvs. 66. 130. sq. where such people are enumerated who were employed by prince Parakkamabāhu as spies in the country of king Gajabāhu. The Chronicler was influenced, it is true, in his description by the Kauṭaliya Arthaśāstra (cf. W. Geiger, *Cūlavamsa* trsl. I, 263, n. 1 &c.), but we may take it for granted that all the types mentioned in that passage, were well known in Ceylon as they also mostly exist there still in modern times.

The spies were wandering in disguise, for instance, as musicians, playing the mandoline and amusing the villagers with dance and song. There were, it seems, often *Damīlas* among the musicians. Other artists were playing with leather dolls just as such popular performances can be seen in Europe at rural festivals. A peculiar class of artists were the snake-charmers (*ahiguṇṭhikā*) often met with even now by each traveller in India.

Itinerant traders used to sell cheap articles as rings and bracelets or pottery for the household. Fortune-tellers, skilled in telling of the lines of the hand, were wandering from village to village, also people expert in mixing of poisons, probably for love-charm, but sometimes also for worse purposes, and *Brāhmaṇas* who were performing the family rites. Craftsmen as goldsmiths publicly practised their profession in villages and market-places in order to attract the interest and the desire of the inhabitants by their skilful work. Even surgeons visited the villages practising their healing art, and wandering teachers who instructed the boys in the art of writing.

All these people were in permanent contact with the subjects of the king and had a good opportunity of knowing and controlling their minds.

Mendicant artists (*yācaḱā sippino*) were often supported

by the kings who dispensed a peculiar offering for them, which was called *daṇḍissara*. We cannot explain the name of this offering, but we hear of it between the years 900 and 1100 A. C. (52.3; 53. 30; 60. 22). Since the word *sippa* has a very comprehensive sense, denoting every sort of art or craft or religious studies, nearly all the types occurring in the list of spies sent out by Parakkamabāhu, will be included in the term *yācaka sippino*: wandering artisans and artists, even surgeons, teachers, fortune-tellers and priestly helpers. They are all practising a *sippa*. But it is common to them that they do not receive a regular payment for their work, but must take it in each case from the hands of the villagers according to their means and willingness, like unto beggars (*yācaka*) who eke out their livelihood by collecting alms in the streets.

In the first chapters of the Cūlavamsa (=Mhvs. 37. 51. 77) which deal with the history of the fifth to the ninth centuries we meet with the triad *kaṇaṇ'-addhika-vaṇibbaka*. These people are supported by pious kings with abundant alms (37. 76; 41. 66; 44. 67; 51. 85). In this triad the word *kaṇaṇa* has the most general sense; all poor people who are in distress of any kind, are meant by it. By *addhikā*, I think, the pilgrims are understood who are on the road (P. *addhan*, Sk. *adhvan*) in order to visit a temple or other sacred places. Among the spies of Parakkamabāhu were also people in the garb of ascetics, wandering like unto pious pilgrims from village to village and thereby performing their devotion in front of the sacred shrines (66.135-6). It is clear that the support of such pilgrims is a meritorious work for a Buddhist.

Not so easy to explain is the word *vaṇibbaka* (or *vaṇibbin*, often also spelt with *n*). It seems to be cognate with P. Sk. *vāṇija* (Geiger, Pali Gr. 46.1), Pk. *vāṇia*. In Buddhist Sk. the form is *vanipaka*, occurring also as *vāṇiyaka* in the Divyāvadāna (Stede, Pali Dict. s. v.). I therefore believe that *vaṇibbaka* is the same or nearly the same as *yācaka sippin*, and that it means a wandering

trader, a wayfarer or tramp. This is also confirmed by the use of the word in the canonical Buddhist literature. Here in *Digha Nik.* I, 137<sup>24</sup>, II 354<sup>14</sup> the triad *kaṇṇ'addhiḱa-vaṇibbaḱa* is preceded by *samaṇa-brāhmaṇa* and followed by *yācaḱa*, denoting the professional beggar. It is obvious that in the whole compound are comprehended all the classes who should be supported by a pious Buddhist, first of course by a pious king. The wayfarers must be among them, they ought not to be omitted.

In *Jāt.* IV 405<sup>21</sup> (cf. also 406<sup>24</sup>) a Brāhmaṇa who has grown blind is addressed with *vaṇibbaḱa*. Owing to his blindness he is unable to perform regular activity in a temple, but must earn his livelihood by wandering from house to house as a mendicant priest. Another Brāhmaṇa is called *vaṇibbaḱa* *Jāt.* IV 459<sup>28</sup> who makes money as a snake-charmer (*ahi-guṇṭhika*). He must be reckoned among the 'wordly Brāhmaṇas' and this class of priests is perhaps also understood in *brāhmaṇā vaṇibbino* *Mhvs.* 73.32 (cf. above in 70), if this does not mean, what seems to me more probable, mendicant priests.

By *Wijesimha* *Vaṇibbaḱa* in all the passages where it occurs, is rendered as 'mendicant' or 'beggar' but in 41.66 (cf. I.1, p. 14) as 'mendicant minstrel'. This is not wrong, but too narrow. The translation 'mendicant artist' would have been better.

78 Finally, a few remarks on the *outcastes*. The *Caṇḍālas* were in ancient Ceylon in the same position as in India. They had to perform the lowest and most polluting work, to cleanse the streets and the sewers, to bear the dead and to watch the cemetery. Near the capital *Anurādhapura* they were residing in a separate village north-west of the place where the dead were exposed or burnt (*Mhvs.* 10.91-3). It was a shameful humiliation when at the end of the first century A.C. King *Ilanāga* ordered the *Lambakaṇṇas* who had revolted against him to make a road in *Anurādhapura*, and had set *Caṇḍālas* to be their overseers (35.16-17). In the mediæval part of the *Mahāvamsa* *Caṇḍālas* are not

often mentioned. Spies in the disguise of Caṇḍālas were wandering through Gajabāhu's kingdom (66.132), and Caṇḍālas were employed together with slaves for subordinate labour in public works (88.106).

In modern Ceylon the Caṇḍālas are replaced by the *Roḍiyas* (cf. H. Nevill, *The Taprobanian*, June 1886, p. 81 sq. and August 1887, p. 108 sq.). What we know about the *Roḍiyas* is highly interesting. They are spread over the whole island, living in separate hamlets, and have to do the same unclean work as formerly the Caṇḍālas. The intercourse with them is strictly avoided by Sinhalese of the better classes. They are beggars as well as thieves by hereditary custom and speak a conventional secret language comparable to the language of thieves in Germany. It is a corrupt form of Sinhalese mixed with foreign words, the origin of which is sometimes obscure. They have their peculiar manners and customs often different from those of the Sinhalese, but they are by no means a degenerate race. They enjoy bodily strength, the women are often very handsome. As regards their origin and first appearance in Ceylon we are confined to their own very fantastic traditions. It is however remarkable that in these traditions their origin is connected with the personalities of Parakkamabāhu and one of his daughters. I am inclined to suppose that they were people of a non-Sinhalese tribe who immigrated in Parakkamabāhu's era, that is about the eleventh century, into Ceylon. There these foreigners were always regarded as people of the lowest and most detestable class. But they mixed with the Caṇḍālas, absorbed them gradually and became thus in their stead the class of outcasts in Ceylon. This is, however, but a suggestion which may serve as a working hypothesis for future investigation.

## Kaṭāha

By K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI, M.A.

In his remarkable paper *Le Royaume de Çrivijaya*, Prof. Çœdès discussed the location of Kaṭāha, identified it with Kie-tch'a of I-tsing, and Kie-t'o and Ki-t'o of later Chinese writers, and suggested that most probably it lay in the neighbourhood of modern Kedah. And he laid some stress on a point already made by Prof. Blagden that Kedah would be the first place on the Malay peninsula to be touched by anyone sailing from Southern India to the East across the Bay of Bengal.

Çœdès was not willing to accept at its face value the gloss of a late annotator on the *Paṭṭinappālai* which identified *Kālagam* with *Kaḍāram*, and suggested that it might have arisen out of a misunderstanding. "In fact," he said<sup>1</sup>, "Skt. *Kaṭāha* and Tamil *Kaḍāram* both signify 'frying pan, cauldron of copper,' but *Kaḍāram* has also the meaning 'dark brown colour'; now, *Kālagam* has precisely the meaning 'black,' and it is perhaps only this synonymy which has induced the annotator of the *Paṭṭinappālai* and the lexicographers to gloss *Kālagam* by *Kaḍāram*." But the employment of synonyms from one and the same or different languages even in referring to proper names is an old and well-established practice in India, and in the text of the *Paṭṭinappālai*, the word *Kālagam* stands for the name of a place in constant trade relation with *Paṭṭinam* or *Kāveripaṭṇam*,<sup>2</sup> the celebrated port of the early Coḷa

<sup>1</sup> *Le Royaume*, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> The line is: *Īlattunavam Kālagattākkamum*, i.e. food-stuffs from Ceylon, and the produce of *Kālagam*. The mention of *Kidā-ravan* as a variety of aloe-wood (*agil*) by the annotator of *Silappadikāram* is well known.

monarchs of the Śāṅgam age. And the mention of *Kāḷagam* which must mean *Kaḍāram* or nothing, in this early poem of the second or third century A. D. is not without considerable significance to a study of the early history of the Hindu colonies of the East.

In a very interesting paper entitled *Çrivijaya, Yāva en Kaṭāha*,<sup>3</sup> Ir. J. L. Moens has discussed, with great learning and acumen, the location and history of *Kaṭāha*, *Ki (a) ḍāra* and *Kāḷagam*. Ferrand's objections to Çœdès' view are partly endorsed by Moens who considers, however, that Ferrand pushes things too far when he concludes that *Kaṭāha* and *Ki (a) ḍāram* should be taken to be two different countries. Ferrand's position must be stated in his own words:<sup>4</sup> 'Trusting in Epigraphy, M. Çœdès has admitted the equivalence of these four notations, which amounts to saying that  $Kaṭāha \geq Ki_a^i \dot{\bar{d}}āram \geq Kāḷagam$ , or inversely, whatever be the order in which we place these three forms. If such an equation be accepted, phonetic laws will have to be set aside, and we shall fall into arbitrariness. The change in the consonant of the second syllable:  $\ddot{t} \geq \dot{d} \geq l$  is nothing abnormal; but that of the last syllable:  $ha \geq ram \geq gam$  or  $ha \geq gam \geq ram$  is altogether impossible. It seems to me thus necessary to separate *Kaṭāha* from  $K_a^i \dot{\bar{d}}āram$  and take them to be two different countries'. I am afraid these difficulties were mostly of Ferrand's making. We are in the region, as Çœdès rightly recognised, of synonyms in different languages, and not of phonetic changes. *Kaṭāha* is Sanskrit, and the three other words are Tamil; of these, *Kaḍāram* and *Kiḍāram* are variants of the same word (cf. *kaḍā-kiḍā*, *kanā-kinā*, *palā-pilā*, etc.) which has the same meaning as *Kaṭāha*; while *Kāḷagam* meaning 'black' is synonymous with *Kaḍāra*, also Sanskrit, meaning 'twany' or 'dark brown'. The form *Kāḷagam* is

3 *TBG.*, 1937, pp. 317-487.

4 *JA*: 1919, Juil-Aout, pp. 185-6.

the earliest in Tamil literature. So that the Indian names of this kingdom fall into two groups :

Skt. Kaṭāha = Tam. Kaḍāram or Kiḍāram = cauldron

Skt. Kaḍāra = Tam. Kālagam = black, or dark brown.

It is difficult to decide which of these is the earliest form of the name, and all of them seem to be purely Indian words, having little to do with any language native to Indonesia. Mr. Moens, however, suggests<sup>5</sup> that the philological difficulties raised by Ferrand may be removed by assuming that Kaṭāha is the foreign Indian name of a place, while Kaḍāra or Kiḍāra was the Tamil rendering of its indigenous name. He seeks support for this position, I do not quite see how, in the mention of "aḱil Kiḍāraṇ" by the annotator of the *Silappadikāram* and the story of the foolish merchant, in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, who, while trading in Kaṭāha, burns a cargo of aloe-wood into charcoal to be able to sell it the more easily.

For the period of the Coḷa inscriptions and Song annals, end of the ninth to the end of the twelfth century, Moens allows<sup>6</sup> the identity of the kingdom of Kaḍāra with San-fo-tsi, and locates it in the southern extremity of the Malay peninsula, in the neighbourhood of modern Singapore. But he has a general theory that geographical names were not only systematically carried over from India to the archipelago, but from one place to another even within the archipelago. Accordingly, he sets out on a quest for the original location of Kaṭāha, and reaches the conclusion that this must be found in the Keḍu valley in Java.

I do not wish here to discuss the general theory of Moens, but only examine the application of it to the particular instance of Kaṭāha, and consider the soundness of the arguments on which it is based. It seems to me that Mr. Moens makes a false start when he begins his investigation by assuming that at the time when the *Kathāsaritsāgara*

5 P. 416.

6 P. 416.

story of the foolish merchant was recorded, the aloe-wood was unknown in Kaṭāha. But the whole point of the story lies in his act being typical of the young merchant's stupidity, and I do not think any inference of fact can be based on this act, or even on the statement in the story that aloe-wood was unknown in Kaṭāram. Yet Moens feels justified in concluding from this that another kingdom must have borne the name Kaṭāha. He suggests further that, if in that other kingdom also the Śailendras happened to rule as in the later better-known Kaṭāha, then it can safely be assumed that the new kingdom was in a certain sense a continuation of the old. This suggestion is useful as an index to his method, that of applying his hypothesis of the removal of Kaṭāha from one place to another to the facts of Śailendra history.

Thus Moens is led to think of the early mention of the Śailendras in Java and of their great Barabudur monument in the Keḍu plain. Accepting the position that Java was the original home of the Śailendras, Moens argues that the Barabudur monument, the Śailendra, where their *Vaṃśa-kara*, the Buddha Śailendra, was symbolically entombed, must have been completed before the consecration of Candi Kalasan in 778 A.D. He says further: "The Śailendras erected their magic Olympus in Java at the foot of the Menoreh-mountain, the southern end of the pronouncedly basin-shaped valley, surrounded on the north by the mountains of Prahu and Ungaran, in the west by the Sēndara and Sumbing and in the east by Talamaya, Mōrbabu and Mōrapi. Should it then be a surprise if this valley, which was basin-shaped (*keteldal*), (in extent nearly coinciding with the old province Keḍu), got the Sanskrit name of *Kaṭāha*, which name signifies, among other things, a basin (*Keteldal*), and this the more where Kaṭāha and the indigenous name Keḍu are related both phonetically and etymologically?" It seems that the real argument of Moens



in this passage lies at its very end, in the supposed similarity of the names Keḍu and Kaṭāha. At any rate, I am not able to perceive any striking similarity between the two names, and Moens' description of the Keḍu valley, while it seems to suit his theory very well, does not seem to be borne out by a study of any large scale map of Java and its physical features. Moreover, Moens has argued earlier, it will be recalled, that Kaḍāra or Kiḍāra was the Tamil rendering of an indigenous name. It does not seem to be easy to think that Keḍu gave rise to either of these Tamil names.

Moens seeks further support from the *Kathāsaritsāgara* for his position that the original location of Kaṭāha is to be sought in Java. His argument may be summarised as follows: In the story of the two princesses,<sup>8</sup> Guṇasāgara's daughter, Guṇavatī, sent as the bride of Vikramāditya, starts from Kaṭāha to India. "But it so happened that when the ship came near Suvarṇadvīpa, it was swallowed with the princess and the people on board by a large fish." Then the fish is killed by the people of Suvarṇadvīpa and cut open; the ship full of people is released, and the king of the island Candrasēkhara, the brother-in-law of Guṇasāgara, hears of the occurrence, and after some time sends his own daughter along with Guṇavatī to India, so that both the princesses may become the queens of Vikramāditya. Moens treats<sup>9</sup> this miraculous narrative as a shipwreck suffered by the bride on her way, and concludes that Kaṭāha must lie to the East or S. E. of Suvarṇadvīpa, which, according to him, is the same as Malaka.

In another story from the same work, a Brahman Candrasvāmin wanders in the islands across the sea in search of his son. His itinerary is given in verses 56-64 of *tarāṅga* 56. The places mentioned in, order are

8 Penzer and Tawney, IX, p. 50.

9 P. 420.

(1) Nārikeladvīpa, (2) Kaṭāhadvīpa, (3) Karpūradvīpa, (4) Suvarṇadvīpa, (5) Siṃhaladvīpa and lastly (6) Citrakūṭa-pura. After some discussion, the details of which I pass over because the conclusion embodies them sufficiently for our purposes, Mr. Moens<sup>10</sup> reconstructs the itinerary of the Brahman thus from India, across the ocean to West-Java (Nārikeladvīpa); from there one after the other to middle-Java (Kaṭāha), Sumatra (Karpūradvīpa) and Malaka (Suvarṇadvīpa) and finally back to Ceylon. - He adds: "This reconstruction of the itinerary contains nothing that is manifestly erroneous; its probability will be established by the following", and then he passes to a historical demonstration.

Before proceeding to consider the historical argument, I must say that in the reconstruction of this itinerary, Mr. Moens assumes as settled the relative position of Kaṭāha to Suvarṇadvīpa as determined by him from the story of Guṇasāgara. And his identification of Nārikeladvīpa with West-Java has no firm ground to stand on. He refers to Hiuan Tsang's hearsay account of the island, and says<sup>11</sup> that four mountains Maināka, Vṛṣabha, Cakra, and Balāhaka are found there—a statement for which he cites no authority, and I am not able to find any. And these four mountains then become many mountains at a later stage of the argument,<sup>12</sup> and this fact along with the West-Javan kingdom of Tārumā being one of the oldest Hindu settlements known, are the main grounds for the suggestion that West-Java must be held to be the Nārikeladvīpa of the story.

Hiuan Tsang locates his Nārikeladvīpa some thousands of *li* across the sea to the south of Siṃhala (Ceylon). Yule<sup>13</sup> was inclined to identify them with the Nicobars, and Beal<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> P. 423.

<sup>11</sup> P. 421. •

<sup>12</sup> Pp. 422-3.

<sup>13</sup> *Marco Polo*, ii, p. 307.

<sup>14</sup> *Buddhist Records*, ii, p. 252, n. 3.

with the Maldive islands. Watters lastly writes:<sup>15</sup> "We do not seem to know anything about the cocoanut island." Accepting for a moment the suggestion of Yule and adhering to prevailing ideas on Kaṭāha and other places, it seems easy to reconstruct the itinerary of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* as follows: from India across the sea to Nārikeladvīpa (Nicobars), thence to Keḍah (Kaṭāha), Karpūradvīpa and Suvarṇadvīpa i. e. two different parts of Sumatra, and back to Siṃhala (Ceylon). But I will not press this far, as I do not think any great reliance can be placed on these legendary itineraries.

I may note in passing that after discussing the passages in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* relating to Kaṭāha, Ferrand came to the conclusion<sup>16</sup>: 'The simplest thing then is to avow our ignorance: the Kaṭāha of the Coḷa inscription and of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* do not answer to anything we know for certain'. On the other hand, Vogel<sup>17</sup> treats the references in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* more lightly, and is fully satisfied that Kedah furnishes the most satisfactory identification for the Kaṭāha of the Coḷa records. Ferrand, I think, was more to the point when he observed<sup>18</sup>: "Possibly, however, we are dealing not with geographical realities, but with imaginary toponyms common to folklore. The character of Somadeva's work justifies this conjecture... The characteristics of this imaginary camphor island are borrowed from the different insular countries of Indonesia, particularly Sumatra."

We may now turn to the historical side of Moens' argument. He points out<sup>19</sup> that Hu-lan-na-po of Po'li mentioned in the *Souei annals* at the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century is no other than a regular

15 *On Yuan Chwang*, ii, p. 237.

16 *JA*: 1919, Juil-Aout, p. 185.

17 *BKI.*, 75, (1919), p. 633.

18 *JA*: *ibid.*, n. 3.

19 *P.* 423.

Chinese transcription of the Sanskrit name Guṇārṇava, a regular synonym of Guṇasāgara, the king of Kaṭāha mentioned in the *Kaṭāsaritsāgara*. This may well be so; I am not competent to express an opinion on this matter. Then he proceeds to suggest<sup>20</sup> that the Vikramāditya of the story may be either of the two Vikramādityas of the Cālukya dynasty who ruled in the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. There is no use arguing with such pathetic faith in the identity of names and the historicity of fables. Vogel<sup>21</sup> correctly described Somadeva's Vikramāditya as the legendary ruler of Ujjayinī. And in the same chapter in which the story of the princesses is narrated, we find a woman miraculously released by Vikramāditya and his famous Vetāla being escorted back to her husband at Ujjayinī. There is nothing gained by confounding this palpably legendary figure whose glory is attested by the beasts of the forest and by Vetālas with his humbler namesakes of history!

After this Mr. Moens carries on a long and intricate discussion for several pages (424-61) in which some facts are mixed up with many fancies. Very little of this has a direct bearing on the question of the original location of Kaṭāha in Java, and I propose in the main to confine myself as far as possible to this issue. The main conclusions for which Mr. Moens contends in this part of his paper may, I think, be summarised as follows:

(1) The Andhra-Kaliṅga country on the east coast of the Deccan was the homeland of many, if not all, of the migrations which resulted in the establishment of Hindu and Buddhist kingdoms in the Archipelago. The founders of Tārumā in West-Java, the dynasty of Mūlavarman of Koeti, and the Śailendras were among such emigrants. The Andhra-Kaliṅgadeśa was also the Kuṇjarakuṇjadeśa

20 P. 424.

21 *BKI. ibid.*, p. 632.

of the Caṅgal inscription of A.D. 732, the original home of the ancestors of Sañjaya.

(2) The causes of these migrations are to be sought in the unsettled political conditions in India, and the dynastic rivalries of the home-land may be traced in the politics of the colonial states also.

(3) There were two Kaṭāhas—one in Java, Keḍu-Kaṭāha where the Śailendras ruled for about a century and a half from the close of the seventh century A.D. when they migrated to Java from Sumatra (Palembang) as a result of the hostile attacks of Śrīvijaya; from Keḍu they migrated in the middle of the ninth century to the other Kaṭāha in the extreme south of the Malay peninsula and directly on the sea-route from India to China.

(4) The second Kaṭāha was also called San-fo-tsi and this was the Kaḍāram of the Tamil inscriptions. It lay on the mainland of the Malay peninsula in the extreme south on the estuary of the Johore river and on the bank of a small tributary stream Kedarū.

(5) There were three San-fo-tsis at different periods viz. (1) San-fo-tsi-Kaḍāram, (2) San-fo-tsi-Malayu and (3) San-fo-tsi-Palembang, the two last being on the island of Sumatra.

Some of the points raised, like the proper interpretation of the Arab accounts of Zabaj, have been omitted in this summary as of no immediate concern here. I propose now to offer a few observations on each of the five propositions stated above, and then sum up the position relating to Kaṭāha in particular.

That the east coast of the Deccan took a prominent part in colonisation of the eastern lands has long been recognised, and for very good reasons. But the data relied on by Mr. Moens for fresh support to this generally accepted position do not seem to be of any value. What, for instance, is the value of the argument<sup>22</sup> that the comparison of Sannaha to Manu in verse 8 of the Caṅgal inscription is meant to be a

veiled allusion to the Mānavya gotra to which Sannaha belonged, like the Kadambas and other dynasties of the Deccan? Or again, what is the probative value of the supposed similarity<sup>23</sup> between the foot-prints of Pūrṇavarman in West-Java, and the idea underlying the phrase *bappa-bhaṭṭāraka-pādabhakṭaḥ* occurring in Śālaṅkāyana grants, and, though Mr. Moens does not mention it, in those of several other families as well<sup>24</sup>? How can we believe, without any further evidence, that there was a definite relation, as suggested by Moens<sup>25</sup> between Kauṇḍinya and the Viṣṇukuṇḍins, or that Śrīśaila (Nāgārjunakoṇḍa) and Bukit Saguntang near Palembang and the Barabudur represent a common idea?

But it is in his attempt to locate Kuñjarakuñjadeśa that Mr. Moens goes clean off the track, and most of the other errors into which he falls may perhaps be traced to this initial mistake. He starts<sup>26</sup> by declaring his intention to remove from his path the common but mistaken view that Sañjaya practised the same Agastya-cult as the princes of Dinaya in E. Java. "This hypothesis", he says, "supported and worked out in detail primarily by Bosch, rests in fact on nothing more than on the loose suggestion thrown out by Kern that by Kuñjarakuñjadeśa might well be meant the land of Kuñjara, where 'a mountain was created by Śiva, and the abode of the seer Agastya.' This mountain lies on the boundary of Travancore and Tinnevely in the old Pāṇḍya land. Nilakanta Sastri bases on it even his hypothesis that Sañjaya might be a Pāṇḍya". I can only say that almost every scholar,<sup>27</sup> as Moens is aware, who has had occasion to consider this question has been greatly impressed by the validity of Kern's surmise and the support

23 P. 445.

24 Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 186, n. 1.

25 Pp. 436-8.

26. P. 426.

27 One of the latest is Dr. Chhabra. See *JGIS.*, iii, pp. 1707

found for it by Bosch; and I do not yet see any reason to retract my suggestion regarding the origin of the Śailendras. Let us, however, follow the further stages of Moens' argument.

He takes his stand on the absence of any direct reference to Agastya worship in Sañjaya's Caṅgal inscriptions, and says<sup>28</sup>: 'If the land Kuñjarakuñja lay elsewhere than in the locality postulated by Kern, then there would remain nothing left of the role of Agastya as mediator (between Divinity and Royalty) at Wukir.'

Thus he sets out to discover another location for Kuñjarakuñjadeśa. He starts with the statements: "Kuñjarakuñjadeśa, which means 'land of the elephant's tooth', is, in my opinion, only a pseudonym ('schuilnaam') for the original homeland of Sannaha and Sañjaya, both presumably also *birudas* for the true names of the princes. The Sanskrit name for 'ivory' or 'tooth' is '*danta*', and *Dantapura* is the name of the famous old capital of the Kaliṅga land of which we have spoken before, and where Buddha's relic was worshipped with honours till it was finally housed in Ceylon in 313 A.D. according to the Siamese Buddhist Chronicles." And then he passes to an account of Buddhism in the Godavari-Krishna delta country, which we need not follow here. There is no doubt that Kuñjarakuñjadeśa does mean 'land of the elephant's tooth', and in suggesting this meaning for the phrase, Mr. Moens rejects, as he has a perfect right to do, its usually accepted meaning *viz.*, the elephant forest or copse. But if *Dantapura* got its name from the original enshrining of the tooth-relic of the Buddha in that city, it

28 He also states that with this hypothesis of the Agastya cult of Sañjaya is connected a misunderstanding of a Chinese text which refers, not to a removal of the Javanese capital from Mataram to Malang as is usually held, but to a change of centre from Kedah to Baruas on the Malay peninsula. I do not wish to pursue this side of the question here.

is difficult to see how the elephant's tooth or ivory gets into the description of the land. The connection between Kuñjarakuñja and Kuñjaradarī of the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* seems much more direct than that proposed by Moens between Dantapura and Kuñjarakuñja.

Of the detailed correlations which Moens seeks to establish between political events in the Deccan and the developments in the colonies, it is only fair to state that he is himself conscious of the lack of definite evidence in favour of the hypotheses he offers, and says<sup>29</sup>: "Naturally, a great part of what follows must for the present remain only hypotheses, for in the oldest history of the South Indian Continent there still remain many gaps especially in its chronology". And the nature of the arguments on which Moens relies for the hypotheses he puts forward has been briefly indicated already. It is, moreover, not necessary for the purpose of this paper to follow these historical parallels between the history of South India and the Archipelago at any length. That the east coast of South India played a prominent part in the colonisation of the East is generally acknowledged; geography suggests it, and epigraphy, archæology and literature furnish many data in support of it. But Moens attempts to confine this movement to the northern part of this coast, he lays emphasis for instance on the *-arṇava* endings in colonial names to the almost total exclusion of *-Varman* endings, and his claim to be able to trace the occasions and details of this movement, have not carried conviction to me. None of his hypotheses is impossible; but none rests on any tangible evidence. And the total impression produced by the whole string of them seems to be in essence a false picture.

The third of the propositions relating to two Katāhas is also in the same boat. That the Śailendras ruled at first in the neighbourhood of Palembang and were driven



thence to Java at the end of the seventh century cannot yet be proved. The earliest mention of the Śailendras occurs indeed in Javanese inscriptions from Keḍu, but the name Kaṭāha does not occur anywhere in them, and Moens has not cited one single authority for his assumption that the district of Keḍu had the name Kaṭāha. Again, the theory that they migrated from this Kaṭāha to another more directly on the sea-route from India to China in the south of the Malay peninsula is just a hypothesis and nothing more. Moens indeed promises to prove this when he says:<sup>30</sup> "From the following demonstration it will become clear that neither did the Śailendras of Java dominate Sumatra in the heyday of their Buddhism, nor Śrīvijaya the Śailendras of Java, but that the lordship of the Śailendras of Kaṭāha over Śrīvijaya first became possible, *after they had abandoned Java which lay out of the way*, for the emporium which was located directly on the great maritime trade route." But I am not able to find anything of the nature of a convincing demonstration of this in the rest of the article, but much that is based on the assumption put forward in the sentence I have just cited. Again there is much that is vague, uncertain and inconclusive in Moens' view of Śailendra history. He admits that he cannot tell how the *-arṇava* dynasty of Java was displaced by the Śailendras at the end of the seventh century. He says<sup>31</sup> that Śailendra power in Java lasted hardly a century and a half; but we should observe that a century and a half is not such a short period—the Mughal Empire in India did not last longer, and the British Empire has not attained that age yet. Then he says simply that something happened to put an end to the direct power of the Śailendras in Java and to place it under the rule of the successors of Sañjaya. How this happened, and why the Śailendras had to migrate to the new Kaṭāha-San-fo-tsi is left unexplained. "Lastly the

30 P. 417, n. 1.

31 P. 438.

interpretations<sup>32</sup> he proposes for the verses of the Nālandā copper-plate,<sup>32</sup> though they are offered as interpretations according to Eastern canons, are more ingenious than anything known in Eastern commentaries, and seem to me to be altogether misguided. But as they have no direct bearing on the location of Kaṭāha, I must not enter into a discussion of them here, but must reserve them for another occasion. Finally, Moens only reiterates his hypothesis when he says:<sup>33</sup> "In the light of the foregoing new standpoints relating to the course of events, we must consider it practically established that the Śailendras transferred the centre of their power in the second half of the ninth century from Java-Kaṭāha to Malaka-Kaṭāha." I am unable so to consider it, and I am equally unable to see that this hypothesis is necessary to explain, as Moens seems to think it is, Krom's view that the Śailendra monuments of Java are not those of a subject province, or Vogel's hypothesis of two branches of Śailendras in this period, or the presence of Malayan house-types on Śailendra monuments.

When we come to the fourth proposition on the location of Kaṭāha-San-fo-tsi, Moens' argument seems to stand on much better ground, though even here there are objections of a serious nature in the way of an unreserved acceptance of his conclusion. He says that he could not judge if Ferrand's phonetic objections<sup>34</sup> to Çœdès' identification Kaṭāha-Kedāh are valid or not, but that he would show that geographically they were two different places.<sup>35</sup> He then points out that Çœdès' general supposition, that men often apply to a country the name of the first place they come to while entering it, has no application to the case of Kaṭāha-Kedāh, because the Coḷa expedition was one, not of exploration of an unknown land, but of conquest of a known country. Surely this is not unknown to

32 Pp. 440-2.

33 P. 446.

34 *JA*: 1919 Juil-Aout, pp. 181-2.

35 Pp. 446-7.

Coedès, and his obvious meaning is that whenever the name Kaṭāha came to be applied to the country, he does not say it was first applied to it on the occasion of this expedition, its origin might be explained in the manner suggested by him. Moens then accepts the main results of Coedès' researches, *viz.*, that the Chinese kingdom of San-fo-tsi (of the Song annals) is the same as the double kingdom of Kaṭāha-Śrīvijaya of the Coḷa inscription, but then he adds that Kaṭāha was the sovereign state, and as the Tamil inscription calls the kingdom only by the name of Kaḍāram, we must accept without question the identity of Kaḍāram with San-fo-tsi. He also points out that Zābaj is not the same as San-fo-tsi as is usually thought, but is the equivalent of Yāva and cites analogies for the suffix -j appearing in Arabic transliteration of geographical names. All this is quite plausible though not conclusive.

But the arguments in favour of the location of Kaḍāra-San-fo-tsi at the extreme south of the Malaka peninsula are not so satisfactory. The first of them is based on Abu Zayd's statement regarding the capital of the kingdom of the Mahārāja that 'it faces China' which, according to Moens,<sup>36</sup> can only indicate a position on Malaka's east coast which is turned towards China, or at least on Malaka's southern point also turned towards China; it can in no case be a place on the West coast of Malaka. But this argument, it will be noticed, does not meet the position that Śrīvijaya was the capital of the United Kingdom of Kaṭāha-Śrīvijaya, and that Śrīvijaya lay in the neighbourhood of Palembang. The data of Abu Zayd on the capital of the kingdom of the Mahārāja will fit this situation equally well.

Moens<sup>37</sup> then draws attention to the text of Chu-ku-fei regarding San-fo-tsi as an important thoroughfare on the route from India to China, and explains his sailing direction

<sup>36</sup> Pp. 450-1.

<sup>37</sup> P. 461.

as 'due north' from there to China as due to the Chinese misunderstanding of the true line of the Malaka peninsula, and holds that this does not invalidate his location of San-fo-tsi in the extreme south of the peninsula. He also says that Chau Ju-Kua's statement that the products of Arabia were brought to San-fo-tsi and thence transhipped to China must also refer to the southern end of the peninsula, as it would be very roundabout to take Sumatra on the way to China ; and he applies the data of Chau Ju-Kua regarding many people of San-fo-tsi bearing the surname Abu, and the presence of books written in Arabic characters and so on also to the same place.

But his chief argument rests on the Arabic data regarding K. d. r. ng of about 850-950 A.D. He points out<sup>38</sup> that the Arab writers mention on the route to China the seas of Kalāhbār, Salāhaṭ, and Kadrang or Kadarang in order. He argues strongly in favour of Kalā being equated with Krā. From Krā on the sea of Kalāh-bār, to traverse the whole of the sea of Salāhaṭ, it takes twenty days, and the middle point of the journey is Betumah, which may be identified with Butong island 6°. 30' N.L. in the Langkawi group, a little to the north of Penang ; while Kadarang is no other than Kaḍāram of the Tamil inscriptions equally distant from Butong to the S.E. as Krā is to the N.E., and the sea near it takes its name from the place. Again, Chau Ju-Kua's statement that a chain was stretched across the sea-route as a barrier against pirates of other lands can apply only to Kaḍāram at the southern extremity of the peninsula<sup>39</sup>. Again another Chinese writer says that in 961 A.D., San-fo-tsi was also called *Sien-lieou*, a name obviously shortened from *Sien-lo-yue*, i.e. *Seluyat* of Arabs, and *Lo-yue* of Kia Fan. Lastly, Moens argues<sup>40</sup> that Lin-ya-mon which is reached after a month's journey from China and where, according to

38 Pp. 463-8.

39 P. 469.

40 Pp. 470-1.

Chau Ju-Kua one-third of the merchants put in before entering San-fo-tsi, must be the eastern end of the Strait of Singhapura. And this together with the names prevalent in the locality like Keḍaru and the presence of a hillock there justify the location of the strongly guarded Kaḍāram in this place.

If this were all that had to be said, the argument of Moens may be taken to be very plausible, and the case for it could certainly not be considered weaker than many others that have been generally accepted. But there are two observations to be made on the data on which Mr. Moens has built his argument. First, there seems to be no absolute clearness or consistency in the names employed by the Arabic writers to the different parts of the sea in the East. Masūdi speaks for instance in one place<sup>41</sup> of the 'numerous creeks formed by the sea of China on the sides of Djāwaga and of the empire of the Mahārāja, king of these isles'. One naturally begins to be sceptical about logical demonstrations based on data selected from writings of such a vague and contradictory character. Secondly, the reading Betuma on which Moens depends for identifying it with the Butong island seems to be antiquated and wrong; I am not competent to judge of Arabic texts, but as Moens is aware, Ferrand who compared and studied all the geographical texts relating to the Far East thought definitely<sup>42</sup> that Reinaud's transcription *Betoumah* was a mistake, and that the correct reading should be *Tiyūma*, and he also notes<sup>43</sup> that Ibn Al-Fakih's text has the reading *Tuyūma* for *Tiyūma*. But above all, there seem to be serious difficulties in the way of Kadarang being taken to be the same as Kaḍāram. The identification of this place again has been specially studied by Ferrand, and Pelliot

41 Ferrand—*Relations*, p. 107.

42 *Relations*, p. 40, n. 2.

43 *Ibid.*, p. 58, n. 6.

before him.<sup>44</sup> Kia-Tan locates the mountain of Kiun-tu-nong at a distance of two days from Pāṇḍuranga, and says that five days were needed to sail from there to the straits of Malaka. Again the *T'ang* annals state that Che-li-fo-che (Śrīvijaya, Palembang) is at a distance of 2000 *li* beyond this mountain. From these data Pelliot was inclined to identify this place with island group of Puolo Condore off the south-eastern coast of Cochín-China. That the mountain was the most important feature of this place is clear from the statement of Sulayman<sup>45</sup>: 'At Kundrang is a high mountain to which sometimes slaves and robbers fly for refuge.' Likewise Ibn Al-Fakih: 'We find (at Kundrang) a high mountain (which dominates the others).' This high mountain seems to be hardly represented by anything near the location proposed for Kaḍāram by Moens, or even, it must be admitted, in Puolo Condore or Cape St. Jaques with which Ferrand is inclined to identify Kundarang. It is possible that Moens does not think that Kiun-tu-nong of Kia Tan and the *T'ang* annals has anything to do with K. D. R. Ng of the Arabic writers; if that be so, it is somewhat intriguing that, with the previous literature on the subject before him, he did not expressly state this view with his reasons for it.

The last of the propositions relating to three San-fo-tsis at Kaḍāram, Malāyu and Palembang, I need not discuss here in any detail, as it has no direct bearing on the location of Kaṭāha which is the main theme of this paper. The conclusions that seem to emerge from this rather long and intricate discussion seem to be: that no case has been made for recognising the Keḍu plain as the original Kaṭāha from which the Śailendras migrated to another place of the same name; and that the case for locating Kaḍāram in the neighbourhood of modern Singapore on the mainland is no better than that for placing it in the neighbourhood of

44 See Ferrand—*Relations*, pp. 14-17.

45 *Ibid.*, p. 40.

**Keḍah.** It may be added that the identification of San-fo-tsi with Kaḍāram alone in the double kingdom of Kaḍāram-Śrīvijaya, and the application exclusively to it of the data of Chu-ku-fei and Chau Ju-kua also call for much stronger justification than has been offered by Moens for them.

## Some Indian parallels of Lokesvara types In Indo-China

By DR. U. N. GHOSHAL

In his illuminating paper entitled *Lokeçvara en Indo-Chine* (*Études Asiatiques*, t. I, pp. 227 ff), the late M. Finot made a thorough study of the iconographic types of this deity in Campā and Cambodia. The progress of research since its publication makes it desirable to trace the Indian affinities of these types somewhat further than could be done in the paper just mentioned.

From Finot's description it appears that the Indo-Chinese images of Lokeśvara may be iconographically arranged under the following heads:

### (1) *Lokeśvara with two arms*

To this class belong (a) two stone images preserved in the Tourane Museum (Finot, p. 234). They show Lokeśvara with two broken fore-arms resting upon two supports, a figure in the chignon and a frontal eye; (b) a small stone image in the Hanoi Museum. It represents Lokeśvara standing, with two arms, left broken, right holding flask, Amitābha in coiffure (Ibid, p. 234); (c) the bronze image in the temples at Binh-thuân representing Lokeśvara with two arms holding an ewer and a lotus (Ibid, p. 235); (d) Lokeśvara group on Nāk Pān pediments, the god standing between two personages with right hand throwing water from his flask upon the hands of a worshipper and left hand making a gesture (*mudrā*) towards a person bearing two jars of water (Ibid, p. 248). Similar images of Lokeśvara are found on the seven pediments of Krol Kô and also in the Ta Som temple and the small shrine east of Ta Prohm (Ibid, pp. 249-250); and (e) "Pre-khmer" Lokeśvara from the province of Rach-giá (Ibid



p. 238). This has two arms, left closed with a lotus-bud and right opening for showing lotus flower.

### (2) *Lokeśvara with four arms*

Under this category may be mentioned (a) a bronze image from Quāng-tri, now preserved in Hanoi Museum. The four arms of the image hold lotus, flask, conch (?) and rosary (Ibid, p. 234); (b) the bronze image in the two temples at Binh-Thuân (Ibid, p. 235); (c) terra cotta medallions of Quāng-bình (Ibid, p. 235). In these Lokeśvara is seated in *mahārāja-līlā* with four arms, the upper right supporting the head; (d) a stone image recovered from the ruins from Bayon by M. Parmentier (Ibid, p. 246, pl. V). Here Lokeśvara stands upon lotus, Amitābha in chignon, the four arms holding lotus, flask, book and rosary; (e) two seated figures at Nāk Pān with four arms, one of which holds a book (Ibid, p. 248).

### (3) *Lokeśvara with eight arms*

To this class belongs (a) the great image at Don Tei, the right arm holding a book (all others broken), the left holding rosary, *caṅkṛa*, *vajra*, lotus (?), sword, image of Buddha, etc. (b) On certain votive *caityas* lying between the Angkor Thom and Bantāy Chmār sites. Here the god has eight arms of which six hold lotus, rosary, book (twice?), arrow, *aṅkuśa*, while the two lowermost arms are in *varamudrā* (Ibid, p. 254)

As for the first group it may be mentioned that the lotus held in closed left hand and that the same flower exhibited with open petals in the right hand are exactly the attributes of the second variety of Rakta-Lokeśvara described in three *Sādhana-mālā* MSS. utilised by Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharya in his *Buddhist Indian Iconography*. The text of the *dhyāna* of this deity as quoted by Dr. Bhattacharya runs as follows (*op. cit.*, p. 46):—“Raktavar-ṇṇam Amitābhagarbhajaṭāmukutaḍharaṃ vāmakaraḡḡhī-taraktapadmaṃ tacca dakṣiṇakareṇa vikāśayantam.....”



Pl. II. Sculptural fragment from Nak Pan, Cambodia. [Reproduced f  
L. Finot's article, *Lokeçvara en Indo-Chine, Études  
Asiatiques*, I, Pl. 23, fig. 6, with the  
kind permission of the French  
School of the Far East.]

[To face page 56.]



Dr. Bhattacharya, after taking the above to mean that the god should carry the red lotus in the left hand and open its petals with the right, admits (p. 47 n) that '*vikāśayan-tam*' in the above may also mean 'exhibiting', in which case the god would have the lotus in both of his hands. The pre-Khmér Lokeśvara from the province of Rach-giā mentioned under class I (c) shows that the latter is the correct interpretation. In the work above-mentioned Dr. Bhattacharya was unable to discover any actual representation of the Rakta-Lokeśvara type. The Cambodian image, however, offers such a specimen.

Of the group of four-armed images, the one from Bayon with the lotus, rosary, flask and book may be compared with that of Mūlavāsa-Lokanātha of Dakṣiṇāpatha which is twice illustrated in Foucher's Catalogue Nos. 25 and 27 (App. I, *Étude sur l'Iconographie Bouddhique de l'Inde*). The description of this figure by Foucher is as follows—(Ibid, p. 194) : No. 25. "Dakṣiṇāpathe Mūl (?)pavāsa Lokanāthaḥ āriṣasthāna. Bodh. blanc, debout, à quatre bras: 1° inférieurs: m. d. en geste qui assure, m. g. tenant le lotus et le flacon: 2° supérieurs: m. d. tenant le rosaire. m. g. le livre...". No. 27: Dakṣiṇāpathe Mūlavāsa-Lokanāthaḥ: Identique à la min. I 25. sauf le rosaire de la m. supérieure d. oublié. Slightly different from the above is the figure (Foucher, *op. cit.* No. 36) labelled Daṇḍabhuktau Yajñapiṇḍi-Lokanāthaḥ, whose description (Ibid, p. 196) is as follows: Bodh. blanc, à quatre bras: 1° inférieurs: m. d. en charité, m. g. tenant le flacon (?), 2° supérieurs: m. d. tenant le rosaire, m. g. le lotus rose...". Probably the Indo-Chinese steles with lotus, rosary, book and indistinct object belong to the same class. Among the 108 forms of Avalokiteśvara represented in the Macchandar Vihār of Kathmandu, there is none which is exactly similar to the above. But we have one form (No. 12) which approaches the same. This is known as Jāṭāmukuta Lokeśvara. In this form the god has one head with the effigy of Amitābha appearing above; he has four arms, the

upper right holding rosary, the lower right in *varamudrā*, the upper left a lotus stalk, and the lower left a water-pot. (B. Bhattacharya, *Buddhist Indian Iconography*, p. 178 and pl. XLV).

The Indo-Chinese type of four-armed images with rosary, book, *vara* and *bhūmiśparśa mudrā* has no match in any Indian example. But the Eastern Indian School knows a type with the attributes rosary, book, *vara* and lotus type (see R. D. Banerji, *Eastern Indian School of mediaeval sculpture*, p. 88 and the references there given). The same type is represented in Foucher's Catalogue I,23 under the caption *Suvarṇṇapure Śrīvijayapure Lokanāthaḥ āriṣasthāna*. This is described as follows (*op. cit.*, p. 193):—Bodh. blanc, debout, à quatre bras: 1° inférieurs: m. d. en charité, m. g. repliée tenant le lotus; 2° supérieurs: m. d. tenant le rosaire, m. g. le livre; à sa d. autre lotus...".

A slightly different type is known to the Eastern School with the attributes rosary, *vara*, *kamaṇḍalu* and lotus (See Kramrisch, *Pala and Sena Sculptures*, pl. XLVIII).

Of the Indo-Chinese type of *Lokeśvara* with eight arms, it has not been found possible to observe an Indian parallel.

## MISCELLANY

### The Rāṣṭrapālanāṭaka of Aśvaghōṣa

By DR. E. H. JOHNSTON

An interesting note by Pandit Vidhushekhara Bhaṭṭacharya in *Journal*, V, pp. 50ff., draws attention to the mention in the *Vādanyāya* (JBORS, xxi, Pt. IV, p. 67, not p. 63) of a play with this title by Aśvaghōṣa, but the significance of the reference can only be understood by reading with it the late Professor S. Lévi's account of the play from the Chinese in *Journal Asiatique*, 213 (1928), pp. 199-204. He quoted an extract from the *Fu fa tsang yin yüan ch'üan* (Taisho Issaikyo edn., L, 2058), which was translated into Chinese about 472 A.D. It relates how Aśvaghōṣa composed a piece of music called 'Rāṣṭrapāla,' in the words to which he treated of *duḥkha*, *śūnya*, *nairātmya*. In it he said<sup>1</sup>, "Everything *samskṛta* is as an illusion or a phantasmagoria. The three spheres of existence [*i.e. dhātus*] are a prison in which one is bound, and it is impossible to be happy there. The situation of a king appears lofty; he is powerful and free to do as he likes. But kingship is impermanent; who can retain it, when the fatal day arrives? It is like a cloud in the sky, scattered and destroyed in a moment. The body is empty and pithless like a banana-tree; it is an enemy, a robber, and cannot become an intimate friend. It is like a cage [? a pot] full of poisonous snakes; who can love it or take delight in it? This is the reason why the Buddhas have ever impeached the body." This music proved beyond the capacity of those to whom it was given for execution. Thereon Aśvaghōṣa donned white robes and assumed the

1 I translate Lévi's version.

leadership of the orchestra, on which the performance became perfect. In the sequel five hundred Kṣatriyas were so affected by it that they entered the Order, and the king of Pāṭaliputra, fearful that their example would be generally followed and his kingdom depopulated, forbade the play ever to be acted again. Professor Lévi then went on to point out that a similar story is told in a Jaina text, the *Pinḍaniryukti*, verses 474-480, as elaborated by the commentator, Malayagiri, where the play has the same name, but the author is called Āśādhabhūti.

In dealing with Āśvaghoṣa's works in the introduction to my translation of the *Buddhacarita*, I did not discuss the question whether he had ever written such a play, because no text of the play was extant for consideration and there was no proof then that the story in the Chinese work was more than one of the many legends that have clustered round the name of the Buddhist poet. It seemed to me significant for instance that his poems show no special interest in, or knowledge of, music. I should perhaps have given more attention to the description of the verses, which read almost like extracts from the *Buddhacarita* or the *Saundarananda*; Āśvaghoṣa, as I have pointed out elsewhere, tends to repeat the same ideas and arguments in his works. Thus, compare with the extract given above such phrases as *Saundarananda*, v, 45, *parigamya lokam māyopamaṃ citram=ivendrajālam*, *Buddhacarita*, xi, 45ff., the passage about the insecurity and lack of happiness in kingship which begins *ājñā nrpatve'bhyadhikēti*, *ib.*, xxviii, 15 (*Acta Or.*, xv, p. 114 of reprint), 'like snakes which have been confined in a jar'; this list could easily be extended.

These coincidences suggest that the author of the original, from which the Chinese translation was made, may have known a genuine drama about Rāṣṭrapāla by Āśvaghoṣa, and in this connection some curious features of the *Vādanyāya* passage should be observed. It ends *Kiḍṣaṃ Rāṣṭrapālaṃ nāma nāṭakam iti prasaṅgaṃ kṛtvā*

*nāndyante tataḥ praviśati sūtradhāra iti paṭhen-nṛtyed-gāyeca/prativādi taṃ ca sarvaprasaṅgaṃ nānuḥkartuṃ samartha-iti parājitaḥ syāt.* Evidently this implies that the *vādin* repeats the whole play with appropriate action, and for such a purpose would a play have been chosen for illustration which did not actually exist? Further the reference to singing, which would not necessarily be required for reciting the text of many plays, is suggestive in view of the account of the performance given in the Chinese translation. Finally, it appears from *Buddhacarita*, xxi, 26 (*Acta Or.*, xv, p. 56 of reprint), that the poet held the story of Rāṣṭrapāla's conversion to be one of the outstanding incidents of the Buddha's mission. There is thus much to be said for the view that Āśvaghoṣa did write a play about Rāṣṭrapāla, which is no longer extant.

A further point of interest for the history of the drama is the fact that, as in the MSS. of the plays discovered of recent years in the Madras Presidency, the passage of the *Vādanyāya* makes the play begin with the stage direction *nāndyanta*, etc.



## Epigraphic Notes

By DR. DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

### 1. *Phnom Práh Vihār Inscription of the time of Bhavarman*<sup>(1)</sup>

This record in Sanskrit verse describes the activities of a *Pāśupatācārya* named Vidyāpuṣpa who is called *Kavi* and *śabda-vaiśeṣika-nyāya-tattvārtha-kṛta-niścaya*. Verses 6 and 7 of the record say about the Śaiva saint :

tatas = sa niṣkraman = nānā-  
tīrth-āyana-parvatān ;  
Kathañ = cid = ānīta iha  
svapn-ānte sri-triśūlinā.  
Yathā pradarśitaṃ svapne  
dṛṣṭavān = iha śāṅkaram ;  
liṅgaṃ padaṃ goṣpadañ = ca  
bhasma tuṅgīśaparvate.

The seventh verse has been thus translated by Çædès :  
“Il vit (ensuite) ici, tels qu'il les avait vus en songe, le liṅga de Śaṅkara, le pied, la flaque d'eau et la cendre sur le (mont) Tuṅgīśaparvata”<sup>(2)</sup>. In a footnote on the word *pied* in the translation, he further suggests, “*pada*, ‘empreinte du pied’, ou peut-être ‘séjour, demeure’ (de Śiva?)”

The verse appears to mean that the place, previously shown to Vidyāpuṣpa by Śiva in a dream was recognised by him by the presence of a Śivaliṅga and some signs indicating the lord's presence, such as *pada* (i.e. Śiva's *pada-cihṇa*), *goṣpada* (i.e. *padacihṇa* of the lord's carrier Nandin, generally called Nandipada) and *bhasma* (ashes which the lord rubs on his body)."

1 *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, éditées et traduites par G. Çædès, Hanoi, 1937, tome. I, p. 4.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 5.

## II. Tān Krañ Inscription of Jayavarman I<sup>(3)</sup>

Verse 4 of this partially mutilated record in Sanskrit verse describes King Jayavarman as :

*adhārmika-jana-dhuvāntaṃ*  
*nav-odita-vivasvatā;*  
*ā-kāñcīpura-nṛpā \**  
*dūre \* \* \**

It is however difficult to be definite on this point as the fourth foot of the verse is almost totally lost and as the relation of *Kāñcīpura* or *ā-kāñcīpura* with the context cannot be determined. But Çœdès's reading of the sixth syllable of the third foot as *nṛ*, is admittedly doubtful. We think that the metre requires here not a *laghu* syllable like *nṛ*,—but a *guru* one. The facsimile appears to suggest the reading *bhū°*, and the word may be *bhūpālaṃ*.

The next two verses of the record introduce to us a learned Brāhmaṇa named Dharmasvāmin and read :

*atr=āsīd=v (b) rāhmaṇo vidvān*  
*veda-vedū[ṅga]-pāragah;*  
*dharmmasvām=īti v[i]khyātas=*  
*s[ā]kṣ[ā]d=dharma [iv=āparaḥ\*].<sup>(4)</sup>*  
*agr-āsano narendrāṇāṃ*  
*Śrī[r=\*] yā(a) syā[pya\*] ṅgato bahiḥ;*  
*antaḥkaraṇa-saudhe tu*  
*vinystā yena bhāratī.*

Çœdès doubtfully reads the second foot of the last verse as *śrī yāpyā\* ggto bahiḥ* or as *śrīyāsyā\* aṅgato* (or *aṅgino*), and corrects the word *agr-āsano* as *agr-āsane* which however appears to be unnecessary. His translation of the verse is : "Il a (chassé?), hors de ....., la Fortune des (autres) rois (placés) sur un trône eminent, mais il a installé l'Eloquence dans la palais de son cœur." The verse, however, seems to

3 *Ibid.*, p. 8 ff.

4 The restoration of the lost syllables here as *iv=āparaḥ* seems to me beyond doubt.

mean that Dharmmasvāmin who enjoyed an eminent seat in all company, had *rājaśrī* in his appearance, though in his heart dwelt Sarasvatī, Śrī's rival.

### III. *Phnom Bâyañ Inscription of Bhavavarman II* <sup>(5)</sup>

This mutilated record in Sanskrit verse appears to belong to the middle of the seventh century A.D. Verse 23 of the record reads :

*soma-vañśya-prasū[tā]nām*  
 \* \* *lopam = akurvātā* ;  
*Śrī-koṅgavarmma* \* \* *ddh*  
 \* \* \* \* \*

Çœdès points out that the peculiar name *Koṅgavarman* is not found in the inscriptions of Cambodge. It is interesting to note that similar names are found in the south-western part of Peninsular India in inscriptions of about the same period. There was a province called *Koṅgudeśa* in this part of the country, and the name *Koṅgaṇi*, *Koṅkaṇi* or *Koṅguṇi* was quite a favourite with the Gaṅga royal family of Mysore. The seventh century Gaṅga King Durvinīta had the name *Koṅgaṇivṛddha*, while his father's name was *Avinīta-Koṅguṇi*. A prince named *Koṅgavarman* is found in the genealogy of the Kadambas of Banavāsī in the North Kanara District. He was the son of *Mayūraśarman* who founded the Kadamba family about the middle of the fourth century A.D. Does the name of *Koṅgavarmman* of the *Phnom Bâyañ* inscription connect him in any way with the south-western part of Peninsular India?

5 *Ibid.*, p. 252 ff.

## OBITUARY

### MR. N. G. MAJUMDAR

The Managing Committee of the Greater India Society records with deep sorrow the untimely death under most tragic circumstances of Mr. N. G. Majumdar, a most valued member of the Committee and one of the most brilliant products of the modern school of archaeology in India. He was engaged, as Special Officer for Exploration of the Archaeological Survey of India, in a survey of the pre-historic sites of the Indus civilisation when he was murdered on the 11th November, 1938 by a gang of armed robbers near Johi in the Dadu district of Sind.

After completing his studies at the Calcutta University with high honours, Majumdar joined the staff of the Post-Graduate department of the University in the branch of Ancient Indian History and Culture. He had already by this time made his mark as a keen student of Indian archaeology by the publication of his articles in the *Indian Antiquary* and the *Epigraphia Indica* and specially of his important *List of Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions* in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*. Appointed Curator of the Varendra Research Society's Museum at Rajshahi, he distinguished his term of office by producing an important work called the *Inscriptions of Bengal, III*. His remarkable talents singled him out for appointment in the Archaeological Survey of India which he joined in 1927, after receiving his preliminary training on the Mohenjo Daro site under the watchful eyes of Sir John Marshall. His further explorations of pre-historic sites in the Sind area bore fruit in his highly important work, *Explorations in Sind*, which was published as a Memoir of the Archaeological Survey of India. Promoted to the post of Superintendent of the Archaeological Section of the Indian Museum in Calcutta, he published two valuable Guides to the collection under

his charge, and he carried out a number of very fruitful excavations on various sites, such as Lauriya Nandangarh, Kosam, Durgapur and Mahasthangarh. He also edited a large number of Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions which have thrown a flood of light on a number of complicated problems of Indian history. Among other works from his learned and busy pen may be mentioned a valuable chapter on the *Copper coins in the Stūpa Area* in Marshall's *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilisation*, and a chapter on the Sanchi inscriptions for the forthcoming publication of the Archaeological Department entitled the *Monuments of Sanchi*.

Majumdar's high merits as a scholar won him his deserved recognition from many quarters. He was elected a Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1933 and President of the History section of the Bengali Literary Conference at Patna in 1937. His charming manners won him the love and esteem of all those who had the privilege of coming into his contact.\*

\* Based on a paper written by Mr. T. N. Ramachandran, M.A., Superintendent of the Archaeological Section at the Indian Museum, for the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS

**Aanwinsten op ethnografisch en anthropologisch gebied van de afdeeling Volkenkunde van het Koloniaal Instituut over 1937**, Koninklijk Koloniaal Instituut te Amsterdam, Med. No. XLIV, Afd. Volk. No. 11.

This description of acquisitions to the Royal Colonial Institute at Amsterdam for 1937 is from the pen of Messrs. J. Kunst and F. W. Stammeshaus, Conservator and Adjunct-conservator respectively in the section of ethnology at the Colonial Institute. The acquisitions are described according to serial number which runs from 1087-1174. No. 1088 consists of a collection of ethnographica from South-New-Guinea, whereof a ceremonial *proa*, employed in totemistic religious festivities, is very interesting. Of great interest are the forty-four neolithic arrowheads and twenty-four palæolithic implements from Pacitan, East-Java, described under no. 1098, 1-68. In the same connexion are also described twenty palæolithic implements found in the vicinity of Solo in the same geological stratum as that wherein Dubois discovered the skull of *Pithecanthropus erectus*. These palæolithic objects, however, according to the authors, originated with a contemporary but more progressive race. The gifts of Messrs. R. A. H. Arntz and J. H. Mulder are described under no. 1100, whereof 30 a/e consists of five (old?) Balinese *lontar* MSS., derived from Bali, giving informations about some officers. The MSS. may be important from the historical point of view and should be examined. Under no. 1103, the authors describe a collection of paintings, sketches, plastic and ethnographica from Bali, whereof the death of Abhimanyu (Canto xiv from the *Bratajuda*), drawn by Ida Bagoes Gilgil may be singled out for special mention. Mr. F. Lieftinck J. Hzn. presented to the Institute a *kidung* on *lontar*, called *Tutur*

*Mpu Devaraja Brĕma*, in which the said teacher gave all sorts of instructions to his disciple Balanatha. The MS. is described under no. 1141 and was derived from Bali. But perhaps the most important acquisitions to the Institute are the coins from the Indian Archipelago and South-East and East Asia which are described under nos. 1144, 1-87, 88-733. Various Asiatic and European coins are also mentioned in that connexion (nos. 734-896). The coins of the Indian Archipelago belong to various periods : six are silver Hindu-Javanese *mā*-coins, twenty-three bronze Hindu-Javanese (so-called) temple coins (presumably used as votive-coins), six very rare tin doits, etc. The Chinese 'coins' range from 1760 B. C. and represent all Chinese periods.

The Report contains an index of indigenous words. To the scholars interested in the subject the Register of origin and grouping of the objects will be extremely helpful and this practice should be followed in the Indian Archæological Reports.

H. B. SARKAR

**Enkele metingen en Volume-bepalingen aan Nederlandsche en Papoesche schedels**, Koninklijk Koloniaal Instituut te Amsterdam, Med., no. XLVI, Afd. Volk. No. 12, by Prof. Dr. J. P. KLEIWEG DE ZWAAN en Dr. A. J. van BORK-FELTKAMP, Amsterdam 1938.

The present monograph, written by two well-known ethnologists, contains the result of accurate studies on the measurement and capacity of Dutch and Papuan skulls. The materials utilised by the joint-authors comprise 119 Dutch skulls, whereof 69 are male and 50 female, and 129 Papuan skulls, besides 474 upper jaws of Dutch persons of unknown sex. Of these skulls, the greatest length and breadth have been measured, the cranial and orbital capacity have been determined and various skull-indices calculated. A number of measurements on the upper jaws were taken according to the method of Martin ; in the

determination of the capacity of the Dutch skulls and that of the Papuan crania, the authors have followed the method, and used the apparatus, of Th. Mollison in his *Hohlraummessung und Volumbestimmung*, Anthropologischer Anzeiger, VIII, 1932. The authors have tried to establish a number of points, in which the comparative estimate of Dutch male and female skulls and Dutch and Papuan skulls appears to be interesting. It has been found, for example, that the greatest length and breadth of Dutch skulls are usually noticed among the males, that among the Dutch skulls the percentage of mesocephalic skulls is extraordinarily great but the brachycephalic ones bear the largest cranial capacity. The Papuan skulls are, on the other hand, smaller and narrower than the Dutch skulls. The percentages work out as follows : of the Dutch skulls, 36·13% are brachycephalic, 48·74% are mesocephalic and 15·13% dolichocephalic; of the Papuan skulls, 4·65% are brachycephalic, 16·3% are mesocephalic and 79·1% are dolichocephalic. The dimensions of the upper jaw were, on the other hand, generally larger in the Papuan skulls than in the Dutch skulls. Some of the conclusions drawn by the authors differ from those of Prof. Bolk, who noted, for example, that the greatest skull-capacity is found in the cranial indices which are most frequent. This view is not borne out by the scrutiny of our authors, whose method of measurement of skull-capacity differs from that of Prof. Bolk.

The work has entailed considerable labour on the part of the authors and has been written with extreme care. The diagrams have greatly enhanced the value of the book.

H. B. SARKAR

**Anteekeningen bij het Oud-Javansche Bhīṣmaparwa** By J. GONDA, *Bibliotheca Javanica*, 7a, Bandoeng, 1937.

The tract under review is a supplement to the text-edition of the Old-Javanese Bhīṣmaparwa by Dr. Gonda. The



critical edition of the Sanskrit Bhīṣma° is still a great *desideratum*, and Dr. G.'s work, though it has admirably handled the existing printed materials, has not been able to make use of a critical edition of the Sanskrit Mahābhārata which alone can determine the source from which the Old-Javanese redactor drew his materials. The Southern recension of the Sanskrit Bhīṣma° by P.P.S. Sastri appeared rather late : Dr. Gonda did not therefore find it possible to make an exhaustive use of the materials for comparison contained in the Old-Javanese and Southern versions of the Sanskrit text. The work of Dr. G., however, will certainly lessen the labours of the Poona redactors, so far as the sixth book of the Mahābhārata is concerned. The plan of this work is this, that he has given, on the one hand, a summary of the Old-Javanese text, and on the other, a critical apparatus of Sanskrit and Old-Javanese texts, comparing the materials contained in Javanese and various Sanskrit versions of the sixth book. The author admits however (p. 39 n. and elsewhere) that the text-comparisons, given in the book, bear a provisional character and that in future critical comparison, these text-comparisons would be superseded by the readings of the Mahābhārata recensions. When a critical edition of the Skt. Bhīṣma° appears, the time would be very opportune to undertake an investigation on the lines of Wulff in his *Den oldjavanske Wirāṭaparwa og dens Sanskrit-original* (1916) and Hazeu in his *Het Oudjavansche Ādiparwa en zijn Sanscrit original* (1901).

Comparison of the text commences from p. 4 ff. of the tract under review. Dr. G. first discusses p. 65, IV, *adhy.* 43-44; 1533-1669, and his treatment is very thorough. In concluding his studies on this portion of the text, he remarks (*Ibid*, p.6) that in this chapter, in spite of general agreement, there are great many differences in detail. This summing-up of the results of study on particular chapters, though very much desirable, is not generally to be met with in other portions of the book. On p. 31 ff. the author draws our attention to a very significant phenomenon, viz., the death of

Bhīṣma and the burning of his mortal remains, which are not mentioned in Old-Javanese text. Dr. G. thinks it possible however that after his downfall, Bhīṣma lived for some time more and inculcated, as the Old-Javanese Bhīṣma° puts it, the judicious exercise of kingship. This brief passage brings him to the problems of the 12th and 13th books of the Mahābhārata as parts of the Corpus Mahābhārata; and his reasonings are sound and very interesting. We hope he will further work up this point. Chap. II of this book deals with the cosmographic episode in the Old-Javanese Bhīṣma°, which he deems to be "of great importance for the history of the Indian epic." The episode belongs to those parts of which a thorough comparison with the parallel texts is possible. For the discussion of this topic, he gathers a wealth of materials from the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas, and modifies, elaborates and supplements the studies of Dr. Hilgenberg in this field.

H. B. SARKAR

**W. L. Steinhart, Niassche Teksten, Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, deel LXXIII, Bandoeng, 1937.**

Mr. Steinhart, a Protestant missionary of the Lutheran Society, has edited with Dutch translation and notes the Nias-texts under review, of which the first two cantos were published in *TBG.*, LXXIV (1934), p. 326 ff. and 391 ff. He has also thankfully recognised the assistance he has received from Dr. Esser, whose valuable notes he has utilised here and there. The author's own notes have also been very carefully written, and the students who wish to learn the language will find the book an excellent guide; they will appreciate the rhythm of the original verses, partly reflected in the Dutch rendering of the texts. The work will prove interesting to all lovers of ethnology and folklore, as it throws considerable light on the manners and customs of the Nias-population.

H. B. SARKAR

**F. H. Gravely and T. N. Ramachandran, Three Main Styles of Indian Temple Architecture** (Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum, New Series—General Section, Vol. III, Pt. 1). Published by the Superintendent, Government Press, Madras, 1-26 pp., Pls. 1-2.

**F. H. Gravely, An Outline of Indian Temple Architecture** (Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum Pt. II). Published, October, 1936, 1-22 pp. and Pl. 1.

These are two useful Bulletins of the Madras Museum, published some time ago. The first is a dissertation on the three main styles of Indian temple architecture recognised by the *Śilpaśāstras*, while the second one deals with an outline of Indian temple architecture, thus being some sort of a complement to the first.

The Bulletin first mentioned corrects some misconceptions already prevailing about the characteristic features of the three principal styles of temple architecture, viz., *Nāgara*, *Vesara* and *Drāviḍa*. Fergusson, in his monumental work on Indian and Eastern Architecture, distinguished between three chief temple-types designated by him as Indo-Aryan or Āryāvarta, Cālukyan and Dravidian; these divisions were more or less based by him on particular modes of such structures to be found in different well-marked localities like Āryāvarta, the Western Deccan and the Eastern and Southern Deccan. He does not seem to have used the technical names laid down in the *Śilpaśāstras*, such as the work of Śrī Kumāra, *Suprabhedāgama*, and the *Mānasāra*, which terms according to scholars would fit in with his own divisions; thus, his Indo-Aryan or Āryāvarta, Cālukyan and Dravidian would correspond to *Nāgara*, *Vesara* and *Drāviḍa* respectively. Fergusson's criterion for distinguishing between these types was defective inasmuch as he laid too great a stress on the ethnic element. Havell, in his study of the ancient and mediaeval architecture of India, criticised the classification of Fergusson and pointed out that a slight difference in the ground-plans of the shrines would constitute different

temple-types. He also remarked, on the authority of Ram Raz, that according to the *Mānasāra*, the technical name of a square shrine was *Nāgara*, that of an octagonal one, *Drāviḍa*, and that of a circular one, *Vesara*. He, however, was of opinion that the 'entire planning and every other structural and symbolic detail' of the pyramidal monasteries were based on Indo-Aryan ideas imported from the north. Coomaraswamy discussed the point at some length in his *History of Indian and Indonesian Art* and proved the unity of Indian temple (*vimāna*), though there were 'provincial variations in its formal development, existing side by side with the secular variation in pure style'. He criticised Fergusson's sectarian classification as of an entirely misleading character and pointed out that '*Mānasāra*'s clear distinction of Viṣṇu and Śiva temples followed by Havell and Diez can not be recognised in mediæval practice'. He proved, however, that both the *Nāgara* and *Drāviḍa* styles designated towers 'rising above the *garbhagrha* of a temple, the chief difference being that the *Nāgara* type comes to have a curvilinear form and forms a real spire, while the *Drāviḍa* retains its original terraced formation with ranges of cells at each level'. P. K. Acharya in his *Dictionary of Hindu Architecture* explains the passage in *Mānasāra* on which Ram Raz's statement, as quoted by Havell, is based, thus, 'The *Nāgara* style is distinguished by its quadrangular shape, the *Vesara* by its round shape, and the *Drāviḍa* by its octagonal or hexagonal shape'. The joint authors of the present work have correctly shown that a proper interpretation of the original in *Mānasāra* as edited by Acharya, on which the above statements are based, clearly proves that the latter are incorrect. The *Śilpaśāstras* including the *Suprabhedāgama* and *Mānasāra* really lay down that the *Nāgara* temple-type is characterised by the quadrangular character of the *Vimāna* all throughout, the *Vesara* one by a *Vimāna* crowned by a circular *śikhara* above the neck, while the *Drāviḍa* by a *Vimāna* crowned by an octagonal or hexagonal *śikhara*.

above the neck; the *Mānasāra* alludes to an 'apsidal form in the case of both the *Vesara* and the *Drāviḍa* styles, but not of the *Nāgara*'. The authors have, in this connection, rightly discussed the geographical origin of these three terms and have criticised the findings of P. K. Acharya who also studies this question thoroughly. There is no difficulty about explaining the geographical association of the *Drāviḍa* type; but to associate *Nāgara* and *Vesara* with northern India (the land of the *Nāgarī* alphabet) and with the Telugu country respectively, as has been done by Acharya, is unjustifiable according to the authors. They propound that even though the association of the first with a northern style goes back at least to the latter part of the 16th century, the term northern is a relative one and it really denotes that part of the Deccan which lay separate from the Tamil land; they go further and locate the *Nāgara* style (its definition is intended to apply to the Kadamba style also) in the Cālukyan country which would thus be northern in relation to that of the *Drāviḍa* style. They have, however, based this hypothesis on certain premises which are partially open to objection. Thus, while advocating the southern origin of the *Mānasāra*, they think that the reference to the images and shrines of Subrahmaṇya as well as of Saptamātṛkās, and to the antelope and drum as attributes in the hands of Śiva in the work distinctly emphasises its southern character. But it must be observed that as early as the early centuries of the Christian era, Svāmi Brahmaṇya, a variant of Subrahmaṇya was well known in northern India as a synonym of the War-god (Cf. the coins of the Yaudheyas found in the southern and south-eastern parts of the Punjab); the Saptamātṛkā images do not hail from the south of the Vindhya only and lastly antelope as an attribute of Śiva was also sufficiently well known in the north in the early centuries of the Christian era (Cf. the representation of Śiva on the *Oesho* coins of the Kaniṣka group of kings). Nor is their allusion to Führer's discovery

of a large two-storied Śiva temple, 'built of carved brick and dating from the 1st century B.C.' at Rampur in the Bareilly district of the United Provinces, a very happy one. However, these few minor points raised here do not in the least minimise the usefulness of the publication in question. The authors have gone deep into it and their first-hand acquaintance with a good many of the early Deccan temples and their proper understanding of their architectural details have enabled them to tackle satisfactorily the difficult problem of the determination of the various temple-types as laid down in texts.

Dr. Gravely, the author of the second Bulletin on '*An Outline of Indian Temple Architecture*', has developed the theme already outlined in Bulletin No. 1. The author here has not only used the frame-work of his earlier joint effort to fit in many interesting and new data collected by him after a careful observation of many Deccanese temples, but also has widened his scope and taken into consideration many and various temple-types of northern India, hailing from such remote regions as Nepal and Kashmir. He has rightly struck a note of caution about the identification of the 'Northern' or 'Indo-Aryan' style of Fergusson with the *Nāgara* style of the *Śilpaśāstras*. As regards Fergusson's Southern form of temple to be equated with Dravidian—the name of a single style, the author has rightly pointed out that in this, a confusion has been made between two really different styles of temple architecture which developed along different lines in southern India in the Tamilian and Kanarese districts. For minimising the danger of confusion, he would dub one of the two as Tamilian which would properly describe the one current in the Tamil land. He has discussed the evolution of some interior decorative motifs of this style with a great deal of precision. •

It is impossible to take stock of all the special features of the above Bulletins in the short space of this review. It must be observed, however, that these two well-written

works have much enhanced our knowledge about this most intricate problem of Indian archæology and similar attempts with such handling of detail will be greatly appreciated. The drawings accompanying the volumes and the single plate appended to the second one fully serve their purpose.

JITENDRA NATH BANERJEA.

## **Honorary Secretary's Report on the Eighth International Congress of Historical Sciences, Zurich, 1938**

Zurich the largest city in Switzerland, the centre of her industry, commerce and finance, and the seat of her world-renowned educational institutions, was the venue of the Eighth International Congress of Historical Sciences which held its sittings during the week from the 28th August to the 4th September 1938. To what extent this session has justified the title of the Congress will best appear from the fact that it was attended by delegates from no less than forty-nine different nations including, as the President declared, the first representative déléation from British India. Even distant and war-distracted China sent her representative in the person of Dr. Hu-Shi, Hon. Ph. D. (Harvard). To quote further the felicitous words of the Congress President it was as if the authorities had discovered a new world like what was found by the Spanish adventurers. Among the delegates attending the Congress from British India, one noticed Father Heras, representing the Government of India, Prof. Ward representing the University of the Punjab, Prof. H. K. Sherwani, a representative of the Osmania University, while the Greater India Society was represented by its Hony. Secretary, Prof. U. N. Ghoshal. On the opening day of the Congress, welcome addresses were delivered in French, German and Italian (the three official languages of Switzerland) on behalf of various Swiss organisations. This was followed by the learned address of the President of the Congress, Prof. Harold Temperley of Cambridge University, which fully shared in the polyglot character of the Proceedings. On the six following days took place in the spacious rooms of the Federal Institute of



Technology the meetings of the different sections of which there were as many as fifteen this year. These were (I) Prehistory and proto-history, (II) Classical Archaeology, (III) Auxiliary sciences, Archives and Organisation of Historical Work, (IV) Numismatics, (V) Middle Ages and Byzantium, (VI) Modern times down to 1914, (VII) History of Non-European Lands, (VIII) History of Religions, Church History (Middle Ages and Modern times), (IX) History of Laws and Institutions (Middle Ages and Modern times), (X) Economic and Social History (Middle Ages and Modern times), (XI) Military History, (XII) History of Ideas, (XIII) History of Sciences, (XIV) Historical Method and Theory of History, and (XV) International Centre of Synthesis. In addition, four sittings were devoted to a special section, that of Historical Demography. The largest number of papers was offered for section VI which accounted for as many as fourteen sittings. In section XII Prof. Sherwani read a paper on Islamic Political Philosophy which was well received by the audience. What concerned India and its outward connections came under section VII (History of Non-European lands). In this section Dr. Ghoshal read a paper on *A Rare Indian temple type in Combodia* in which he sought to identify the term *nandiḱa* mentioned in a recently discovered inscription of Cambodia with a type of square temples mentioned in Agni and Garuḱa *Purāṇas*, the *Mānasāra* and the Jaina canon. He also tried to connect the known characteristics of the art of Indravarman I (author of the Cambodian inscription) with the description in the *śilpāsāstras*. Prof. Krom, Father Heras, Dr. Wiedmar and others joined in the resulting discussion. This was followed by a paper of Prof. H. G. Seth which was read in the absence of the author by Prof. U. N. Ghoshal, Vice-President of the section. Then came the ingenious and learned paper of Father Heras, *The story of Minotaur in the light of Mohenjo-Daro inscriptions*, in which he sought to connect the pictorial representation on a Mohenjo-Daro seal with the well-known Greek legend of Theseus and the

Minotaur of Crete. This naturally gave rise to a lively discussion.

Among the items of business done by the Congress, one which was of special interest to India was the formation of a Commission of the Far-East with European and Indian members for establishing contact with India, China and other lands. Another important development was that the proposed Indian Historical Association, which had been in the air for some time, took some definite shape, and a provisional scheme was drawn up for preparation of a bibliography of Indian historical publications in recent times. This last work was done at some informal meetings in which Father Heras, Prof. Ward, Prof. Sherwani and Prof. Ghoshal took part.

Zurich abounds in excellent educational and other institutions of which the members took full advantage during the Congress sittings. Among its objects of special interest to students of History and Archaeology may be mentioned the Zwingli Room in the Central Library along with its historical exhibition, specially arranged for the occasion, of Swiss illustrated chronicles as well as book-sheets and prints of 15th and 16th centuries, the array of historical documents with papal and imperial seals and seals of Swiss cantons, etc. at the State Archives, the pre-historic collection and the rooms of various centuries at the Swiss National Museum, and last but not the least, the collection of Swiss and foreign painters and sculptors from the 15th to the 20th centuries at the Art Gallery.

We can only notice here a few of the entertainments arranged by the Congress authorities for the delegates and visitors who enjoyed them immensely. There were the reception by the Society of Antiquaries and the University at the Technological Institute, the receptions of the Guild-houses, the steamer-trip to Rapperswill (including a visit to the Polish Historical exhibition in the mediaeval castle), the reception by various consulates and representatives of the Zurich society, the reception by Prof. and Frau von

Meyenburg at their quaint residence on the banks of the Zurich Lake called the 'Schipf', the railway trip to the lofty peak of Rigi-Kulm commanding a magnificent view of five Swiss cantons with the lakes, and so forth. Besides these, there was a little entertainment given to the British Indian delegates by the members of the British delegation at a local restaurant. This gave an opportunity for mutual contact which was much appreciated by the Indian delegates. It was also a matter of gratification to the latter that one of them, Father Heras, was elected to the Executive Committee of the Congress for the coming term.

The last sitting of the Congress took place like the opening session in the beautiful Church of St. Peter.

## **Honorary Secretary's Report on the Twentieth International Congress of Orientalists, Brussels, 1938**

The Twentieth Session of the International Congress of Orientalists was held on seven successive days from 4th to 10th September, 1938 at the historic city of Brussels which for the beauty of its monuments and the art and culture of its citizens has fitly won the title of *la petite Paris*. It was quite gratifying to find that India was represented at the Congress by no less than eight learned institutions, not to speak of the Universities of Calcutta and Bombay which also sent representatives. Among the delegates attending the Congress one met the familiar figure of Father Heras who worthily represented along with Prof. Raghu Vira the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute of Poona ; Mr. S. Yusuf, Assistant Director of the Hyderabad Archaeological Survey ; Dr. R. P. Masani who represented the Bombay University with other institutions ; Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji who attended as a representative of the Calcutta University and of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. The Greater India Society was represented by its Hony. Secretary Prof. U.N. Ghoshal who was also the representative of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal and the Calcutta University. There was besides a sprinkling of Indians persecuting advanced studies at the British and the Continental Universities. The opening sitting of the Congress took place under the presidency of the Minister of Public Instruction in the grand hall of the Palais des Academies which is one of the most distinctive edifices in the Belgian capital. It was here that the President of the Congress, Dr. Jean Capart, delivered his speech after the welcome address by the Minister of Public Instruction. The following days were devoted to meetings of the different sections, of which there were

as many as nine : (1) Egyptology and Africanism, (2) Assyriology, (3) Central Asia, (4) India, (5) The Far East and Indonesia, (6) Semitic Languages and Peoples, (7) The Old Testament and Judaica, (8) Islam, and (9) The Christian East. The sessions were held in the rooms of the Royal Museums of Art and History which for the richness and variety of their collections rank among the greatest in the world and whose situation in the midst of the magnificent Parc du Cinquante-naire commemorating the fiftieth year of Belgian independence is such as would delight the eyes of all lovers of beauty. Of the papers presented at the Congress we may mention a few bearing specially on Greater India. These are G. de Hevesy—*Une immigration inconnue dans l'Inde* (suggesting on the basis of the Munda languages an Uralian migration into India before the coming of the Aryans); H. G. Quaritch Wales, *Light thrown by recent excavations on identification of some historic sites in Malaya* (announcing the results of some excavations still in progress), M. Lalou, *Les manuscrits tibétains de Toueng-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris* (announcing completion of the first fasc. of catalogue of this precious collection by the end of this year), and R. le May, *A survey of Buddhist sculpture in Siam* (distinguishing six periods in the history of this art from 400 to 1600 A. D.). Prominent mention may also be made of the most interesting lantern lecture of J. Hackin, *Reconnaissances archéologiques en Afghanistan* (delivered under the joint auspices of the Belgian Institute of Advanced Chinese studies, the Belgian Society of Oriental Studies and the Section on the Far East and Indonesia) at the Hall of the Colonial Union, in which by means of colour films the learned conservator of the Musée Guimet gave a most informative survey of excavation work undertaken by him on some Afghanistan sites during recent years. Among papers specially concerning India may be mentioned:—K. Chattopadhyaya, *The goddess Śimalia-Sumalia* (suggesting that she was a Mother-Goddess and not a mountain-goddess and was

connected with the Great Goddess of Phrygia), S. K. Chatterji, *Sanskrit and the Perso-Arabic alphabet* (remarks on a unique MS. giving some Sanskrit texts in this Perso-Arabic script in the collection of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal from which valuable sidelights are thrown on the mediæval pronunciation of Sanskrit in Kashmir); Ibid, *The origin of the name Calcutta*; S. Corbiau, *Le Culte de la double-hache dans l'Inde*; U. N. Ghoshal, *Some types of circular temples in Ancient India* (distinguishing five types of such structures actually in existence and connecting them with descriptions of similar types in the *Śilpaśāstra*, illustrated with 16 diagrams); H. Heras, *A Proto-Indian representation of the Fertility God* (remarks on a nude figure on some Mohenjo Daro amulets with suggestions of Sumerian, Cretan and Egyptian affinities); J. Filliozat, *Nagarjuna et Agastya* (remarks on certain texts on alchemy and black magic attributed to these personages); St. Schayer, *Einige Bemerkungen über das Zeitproblem in der frühbuddhistischen Philosophie* (suggesting that Kāla is only a synonym for Śaṃskāra, according to the system of the Kosa); Raghu Vira, *On the proposed new edition of the Rāmāyaṇa*; Otto Stein, *The importance of the study of the Śilpaśāstra*; Pisani, *On the Mahabharata problem*; H. von Glasenapp, *Der Ursprung der buddhistischen Dharma-Theorie*; J. Ph. Vogel, *A project for a dictionary of the ancient geography of India*, and S. Yusuf, *Paithan excavations* (lantern lecture).

The occasion of the sitting of the Congress was marked by a number of important presentations of works made by some of the delegates. Such were the four volumes of metrical versions in Italian of portions of the Mahābhārata with connecting links by Prof. Carlo Formichi, who collaborated with the translator, the late Dr. Kerbaker, along with Dr. Pisani; a number of Vedic and other works by their editor and publisher, Prof. Raghu Vira; some files of the *Journal of the Greater India Society* presented by the editor Prof. U. N. Ghoshal; some numbers of the *New Indian*

*Antiquary* by Prof. S. K. Chatterjee, etc. In presenting on behalf of the Italian Indologists the four volumes of the Mahābhārata in Italian the work is to be completed in five volumes in all), Prof. Formichi speaking in his mother tongue paid a glowing tribute to the Mahābhārata as the greatest poem of the world. A noteworthy item of business at a meeting of the Indian section was the adoption, at the instance of Prof. Otto Stein, of a resolution requesting the Director-General of Archaeology to take steps in collaboration with the various Indian Universities for preparing a series of atlases of Indian material civilisation. The Indian Section adopted another resolution recommending to the support of all interested bodies and persons the new variorum edition of the Rāmāyaṇa projected by Dr. Raghu Vira.

The busy days of the Congress were made very enjoyable to the assembled delegates by a round of entertainments. Of these special mention may be made of the reception by the Municipal Administration of Brussels at the Town Hall dating from the 15th century and adorned with numbers of historical pictures, the reception by the Belgian Government at the Royal Museum, and lastly the reception by the Catholic University of Louvain, followed by the excursion to the Colonial Palace and the Belgian Congo Museum at Tervueren with its magnificent park. Mention may also be made of the reception at the Royal Library (accompanied with an exhibition of its oriental collection). Like the opening session, the last sitting of the Congress took place at the Palais des Academies, when after the concluding address of the President and the passing of a number of resolutions, Paris was announced as the seat of the next Congress and a thanksgiving address was delivered by Prof. D. S. Margoliouth.

## SHORT NOTICES

We have pleasure in announcing that the authorised English translation of Prof. Krom's *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis* by Mr. H. B. Sarkar, which was undertaken by the Greater India Society last year, is complete in MS. It is now being revised in successive instalments by its learned author who is adding to his claim for the Society's gratitude by enriching it with supplementary notes. It is expected that the work will be sent to the Press in two or three months' time.

\* \* \* \*

We beg to inform our readers that our forthcoming publication, Prof. G. Tucci's *Travels of Tibetan pilgrims in the Swāt valley* is in an advanced stage of printing. We can only regret the delay that has occurred in the appearance of this work.

\* \* \* \*

The library of the Greater India Society has been enriched by the acquisition of nearly seventy photographs of antiquities mostly from Central and Eastern Java, which have been kindly supplied by Dr. W. F. Stutterheim, Head of the Archaeological Survey of Netherlands-India, in exchange for a complete set of the Greater India Society's publications. This has been one of the happy results of the contact which the Honorary Secretary of the Greater India Society was able to establish with Dr. Stutterheim at the Trivandrum session of the All-India Oriental Conference last year.

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Kalidas Nag, Joint Honorary Secretary of the Greater India Society, returned to India after four months' tour in Australia and the neighbouring lands. Selected as a representative of the Government of India at the second session of the British Commonwealth Relations Conference



which was held at Sydney in September last, he visited on the way the Universities of Perth, Adelaide and Melbourne. At the close of the Conference, he made a trip to New Zealand studying Polynesian art and antiquities among the Maoris and visiting the Universities and Museums of Auckland and Wellington. In the following November, he passed through Melanesia to the Philippines, where he delivered a series of lectures on Greater India and cognate topics at the State University of Manilla and other learned institutions. The Institute of Pacific Relations at Manilla elected him as an Honorary Member of the Society in recognition of his attainments. From Manilla he returned home, revisiting on the way the centres of culture at Saigon, Bangkok and Singapore. Dr. Nag's report will be published in the next issue of the Journal of the Greater India Society.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

The Greater India Society acknowledges with thanks the receipt of the following books, periodicals, pamphlets etc., during the last six months.

### *Periodicals*

Adyar Library Bulletin (Brahma-Vidyā) Vol. I, Part 4, Vol. ii. Part 2, Madras, 1937-38.

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. xix, 1938.

Bijdragen tot de Taal-Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, Deels 96 & 97, 's-Gravenhage, 1938.

Buddha-Prabhā, Vol. 6. No. 2, April, 1938.

Bulletin of the Colonial Institute of Amsterdam, Vol. I, Nos. 2, 3 & 4, Amsterdam, 1938.

Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, tome xxxvii, Fasc 1, Hanoi, 1938.

Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, Vol. ix, pt. 3, London, 1938.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Annual Report for 1937, New York, 1937.

Djāwā, 18 Jaarg, No. 1-2 & No. 3, 4. en 5, Jogjakarta, Java, 1938.

Een Oudheidkundig Jubileum, Oudheidkundig Dienst in Nederlandsch-Indië, 1913-1938.

Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. xiv, Nos. 1, 2 & 3, Calcutta, 1938.

Journal of the Annamalai University, Vol. vii pts. 2 & 3, Annamalainagar, 1938.

Journal of the Assam Research Society, April 1938.

Journal of Indian History, Vol. xvii pts. 1 & 2, Madras 1938.

Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. xvi pt. 1, July 1938.

Koninklijke Vereeniging Koloniaal Instituut, Amsterdam, Zeven en Twintigste Jaarverslag, 1937.

Man in India, Vol. xviii No. 1, Jan-March 1938.

Mededeeling No. xlvii. Afdeeling volkenkunde, Nos. 11 & 12. Amsterdam, 1938.

Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Jaarboek V, Bandoeng, 1938.

Literatuur-Overzicht voor de Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde en Geschiedenis van Nederlandsch-Indië, Jaar. 1937, Deel II, 's-Gravenhage, 1938.

Oriental Literary Digest Vol 1. No. 7. Poona 4, 1938.

Ostasiatische Zeitschrift, N. F. 13 Jahrg., 5 & 6 hefts, Berlin, 1937.

Polski Biuletyn Orientalistyczny, Vol. 1, Warsaw, 1937.

Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde, Deel lxxviii, Aflevering 2, 3 & 4, Batavia, 1931.

Tropisch Nederland, xl Jaargang, No. 14, Amsterdam, 1937.

#### *Books, pamphlets etc.*

Drewes, G. W. J. en Poerbatjaraka, *De Mirakelen van Abdoelkadir Djaeloni*, Bandoeng, 1938.

Sadānanda, Swami, *Suvarṇadvīpa (Sumatra)*, Calcutta, 1938. *Campā*, Calcutta, 1938.

Sahni, Dayaram, *Archaeological Remains and Excavations at Bairat*, Jaipur State, 1938.

Sharpe, Elizabeth. *An eight-hundred Year Old Book of Indian Medicine and Formulas*, London, 1937.

Srikantaya, S., *Founders of Vijayanagar*, Bangalore City, 1938.

Sactivel, *Kṛṣṇa-Līlā*, Paris, 1937.





